



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

ANDOVER-HARVARD LIBRARY



AH 5LSW R

374  
Vindex









12/18, 55

3/



# **Additional Letters,**

**ADDRESSED TO**

**THE REV. G. D'OYLY, B. D.**

**&c. &c. &c.**

---

**PRICE EIGHT SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE.**

---

*Lately Published,*

AND MAY BE HAD OF THE SAME BOOKSELLERS.

---

# LETTERS

TO

THE REV. G. D'OYLY;

*BY VINDEX.*

---

PRICE FIVE SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE SEWN.

---

\*.\* The above were written in *Answer* to Mr. D'OYLY'S  
first *Letters* on the *Œdipus Judaicus*.

6

# Additional Letters,

ADDRESSED TO

THE REV. G. D'OYLY, B. D.

CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE

IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE,

AND

*Chaplain to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury,*

IN ANSWER TO HIS REMARKS

ON THE

ŒDIPUS JUDAICUS.

*by Sir William Gifford*

---

BY

VINDEX, BIBLICUS, AND CANDIDUS.

---

LONDON:

Printed by D. N. SHURY, No. 7, Berwick Street, Soho:

AND SOLD BY SHERWOOD, NEELY, AND JONES,

PATERNOSTER ROW.

1813.



1853 July 6  
Lift of First Letter

# **DEDICATION.**

---

**TO THE EDITOR**

**OF THE**

**QUARTERLY REVIEW.**

---

**SIR,**

**I AM** told that you are a man distinguished by your taste, your talents, and your literary acquirements, and that one of the best English translations of a celebrated Roman poet has proceeded from your pen. I am also assured, that your private character is such as to make it certain, that you would never wish your Journal to be

**a**

made the vehicle of unjust and malignant calumny. Under these circumstances, Sir, I have determined to dedicate these "Additional Letters" to you, in order that you may see to what a point such a candid Reviewer as yourself must have been imposed upon, when you admitted the article *against* the author of the *ŒDIPUS JUDÆICUS*, which appeared in the last Number of the Quarterly Review. To the person who deceived you, I have no doubt that you will be ready to apply the words of an author with whom you are well acquainted :—

————— Prima est hæc ultio, quod, se

Judice, nemo nocens absolvitur ———

Yes, Sir, when you have read these "Additional Letters," you will say, that the author of the article in question cannot feel quite easy in his own conscience; and you will regret that the blundering Mr. D'OYLY has been applauded by a writer in your respectable Journal. That the Chaplain of an Archbishop should have his little train of sycophants cannot be a matter of surprise —

*Quand le maitre a sa cour, le valet a la sienne :*

But you, Sir, must disdain such vassalage. When you shall have read these Letters, you will lament that Mr. D'OYLY should have been so rashly

hailed as an Oriental scholar in your Journal:—When you adapt your globe, as he desires you, to 30° N. L., you will blush for having asserted with him that “only a part of the constellation *Argo* ever rises at all above the horizon:” — When you have examined the Letters of *Biblicus*, (page 299,) you will turn pale at the disingenuous use which has been made of a citation from Epiphanius, and which has been so unwarrantably and uncandidly sanctioned in your Review.

I am, Sir,

Your most humble Servant,

Oct. 14th, 1813.

**VINDEX.**

## PREFACE.

---

**A**FTER an absence of many years, Abdallah Effendi returned to Constantinople. Although unalterably attached to the principal doctrines of the Mahometan faith, there were yet some points concerning which Abdallah scrupled not to express his doubts when he conversed with his friends on religious topics. At the request of some of these he committed his thoughts to paper ; and, unfor-



tunately for him, a copy of his work fell into the hands of a *Mollah*, who was his enemy. It cannot be denied, that Abdallah advanced some opinions, which had never been heard of in the *mosques* of Constantinople, and which were not in unison with those generally entertained by the people. The *Mollah*, who had contrived to obtain a copy of the work of his enemy, rejoiced at the acquisition. Abdallah had said many things which, were they known, could not fail to give scandal to the multitude. He had almost denied, that the pigeon, which picked peas out of Mahomet's ear, conveyed to him the oracles of God — he had hinted that the Prophet did not speak literally, when he said that

the faithful in Paradise should be dressed in scarlet and green — and he had gone so far as to doubt, whether the same inspired person had not been dreaming all the while, when after having made the *tour* of the seven heavens with the angel Gabriel, he found his bed still warm and comfortable at his return.

In addition to all this, Abdallah had the temerity to say, that the Turks had occasionally mistaken the meaning of the Arabic of the *Koran*; and that some parts of that sublime and sacred book were not to be understood literally but allegorically. Thus he thought the words to be divine, which asserted the unity, and pointed out the providence

of God; while he held that there were chapters in the holy writings which bore a sense entirely figurative. He listened with humility and reverence to the proofs which were there given of the benevolence, justice, and wisdom, of the Deity; and firmly believed, from his inmost soul, that the Creator intends the final happiness of his creatures. He heard with pious awe the *Surahs* which were read from the *Koran*, and in which the merciful goodness of God to man is set forth in the fanciful and figurative, but striking, language of Oriental eloquence; and he dwelt with delight and enthusiasm on some of those simple and expressive passages, which were so forcibly addressed to the rude tenants

of the Arabian wilderness. “ There is  
“ no other God than God — There is but  
“ one God, the bountiful and merciful  
“ — He bids the sun to rise, to warm  
“ and illumine the world — He causes  
“ the fountain to spring in the thirsty  
“ desart — He sends the rain from hea-  
“ ven to refresh the earth ; the cattle  
“ pasture on the green herb ; and we  
“ are nourished by the milk which they  
“ produce — For us He has made the  
“ ground to bring forth the corn ; and  
“ for us the vine and the palm-tree yield  
“ their fruits — The providence of the  
“ Lord is manifested in all things —  
“ Not a cloud is pushed by the wind,  
“ but as he wills it — He ordains the  
“ honey-fly to range in the woods, and

“ to deposit the bright-coloured honey  
 “ in the hollow of the tree, or in the  
 “ cleft of the rock, that man may find  
 “ it, and turn it to his nourishment.  
 “ All things have had a beginning, and  
 “ all shall have an end, save only the  
 “ glory of the eternal God.”

While Abdallah read such sentences  
 as these, he presumed neither to doubt,  
 nor to criticise ; but, for his misfortune,  
 there were other passages in the *Koran*  
 about which he would venture to reason.  
 Thus in the chapter concerning the infi-  
 dels, he thought that there were many  
 things, which ought not to be literally  
 understood. “ When the month *Heram*  
 “ shall be past, you shall kill the infidels

“ wherever you meet them ; or make  
“ slaves of them, or put them into pri-  
“ son — Lay snares for them — If they  
“ will be converted, say their prayers as  
“ they are desired, and pay their tithes,  
“ you may then leave them in quiet.”

Abdallah had the rashness to doubt, whether these sentences had proceeded from the God of mercy and justice, at least, in the intention of being literally understood. He smiled too, when he was told, that the souls of the faithful should eat plums and peaches in Paradise — drink *sherbet* out of golden cups — and sleep in the arms of cherry-cheeked *Houris*, who live to all eternity without ever passing the age of fifteen. But his feelings were revolted, and he



sighed, when he heard some of the more ignorant *Sheiks* assuring the people, that all *Giaurs*, whether Christians, Jews, or Pagans, should infallibly go to Hell, where they are to be tormented by Devils, while they sit up to the neck in a lake of fire, and drink boiling water to assuage their thirst. “We ought  
 “not,” said Abdallah, “to understand  
 “the words of the *Koran* in too literal  
 “a sense. An immaterial being, such  
 “as is the human soul when separated  
 “from the body, can partake neither  
 “of corporeal pleasures, nor of corpo-  
 “real pains. That the soul is immortal  
 “I believe,” continued he, “and we  
 “cannot doubt that a just God will  
 “reward the righteous, and punish the

“ wicked, in a future state. Of this our  
 “ holy *Koran* assures us, and here rea-  
 “ son confirms what revelation teaches;  
 “ but it is unbecoming in us to take the  
 “ sacred text in a literal sense, or to  
 “ pronounce what will be the nature  
 “ either of the rewards, or of the punish-  
 “ ments, which will be assigned to us  
 “ hereafter. We may safely believe,  
 “ that the *Moslem*, when they are virtu-  
 “ ous, are those who will be most accept-  
 “ able to God ; but let us not presume  
 “ to foretell the fate of others, who are  
 “ either strangers to our doctrines, or  
 “ aliens from our creed. Concerning  
 “ mere matters of faith and opinion no  
 “ man ought to judge another. It is  
 “ the Deity alone who knows the heart.

“ Belief cannot be compelled. No man  
 “ can force me to believe, that two and  
 “ two make either more or less than  
 “ four. You may enter India with the  
 “ *Koran* in one hand, and the scymetar  
 “ in the other; but you cannot force  
 “ the *Bramins* to believe that your  
 “ sacred book has been inspired by the  
 “ Deity. Conviction is not a thing of  
 “ choice. Why then do you teach the  
 “ people, that God will afflict the souls  
 “ of *Giaurs* with everlasting torments?  
 “ Surely the language of the *Koran* is  
 “ often figurative. Reason, charity,  
 “ every virtue of the human heart, and  
 “ our knowledge of the Creator through  
 “ his works, forbid us to believe, that  
 “ God has ever commanded his crea-

“ tures to persecute and slay each other  
 “ on account of their religious differ-  
 “ ences, When, therefore, we meet  
 “ with passages in the *Koran*, which  
 “ seem to authorize a contrary conclu-  
 “ sion, let us not doubt that the words  
 “ are not to be interpreted literally, and  
 “ that the language is figurative and  
 “ allegorical.”

Such were the opinions of Abdallah,  
 and such the sentiments which he ex-  
 pressed in his writings addressed to his  
 friends.

There was at this time an *Imam* at  
 Constantinople called *Ge-Douleh Ho-*  
*gia*. This personage belonged to the

*Ulemah*. Rigidly severe in the performance of every ceremony enjoined by the *Koran*; a strenuous supporter of the letter of the text; and exact in adhering to the most trifling *minutiæ*; this *Hogia* was dreaded not only by the youth of the city, but by his own brethren of the Law. If any one tasted a drop of wine he trembled for its being discovered by this terrible inquisitor, who would not have uttered the name of a *pig*, for the wealth of the Indies. *Hogs* are always called “the black beasts” by the pious Turks, and *Ge-Douleh Hogia* procured the disgrace of an *Ichoglan*, for having one day given the animal its proper name in his presence. The youthful *Ichoglans* and *Axamoglans* within the

walls of the *Seraglio* turned pale at his name; and there was not a *Neip* in Constantinople who did not dread the power of the formidable *Ge-Douleh*. But his time was chiefly employed in denouncing individuals, who were either known, or suspected, to be heretics of the sect of *Ali*, — to be *Whahabees*, — or to be *Giaurs*. In a word, *Ge-Douleh* was the *Hogia*, or Attorney-General of the *Ulemah*.

The *Mollah*, who was the secret enemy of Abdallah, conveyed a copy of that Effendi's treatise to the *Hogia*, who read it with real, or affected, indignation. The two brethren of the Law consulted together about what was to be



done. Abdallah had not published his work. He had spoken with reverence of Mahomet—he had expressed his admiration of the *Koran* upon various occasions. “True,” said these counselors; “but he has dared to ridicule the  
 “literal sense, which we have been accustomed to take as such, and has told  
 “us, that the language was figurative,  
 “when God commanded the faithful to  
 “slay and extirpate the *Giaurs*. We  
 “must conceal what he has said in  
 “favour of the sacred book; but publish all that he has written against the  
 “literal interpretation, as if his attack  
 “had been directed against the text  
 “itself; and then denounce him as a  
 “perverse, ignorant, and incorrigible

“ infidel. The *Imams* and *Sheiks* will  
 “ make the *Mosques* ring with *our* tri-  
 “ umph and *his* disgrace; while the  
 “ *Neeps*, whose interest it is to follow us,  
 “ and who would not venture, were they  
 “ inclined, to censure us, will stir up the  
 “ indignation of the Public against this  
 “ *Giaur* by their periodical writings.”

That these *Imams* really believed  
 Abdallah to be an infidel; and that they  
 thought his writings to be injurious to  
 the sacred cause of *Islamism*, is scarcely  
 to be doubted. It would be to suppose  
 in them the basest hypocrisy, and the  
 foulest malignity, to imagine the re-  
 verse. In fact, to those who strictly  
 followed the letter of the text, the ridi-

cule, which Abdallah had thrown on the literal sense, could appear as nothing else than as profane and indecorous. They believed that every *Surah* in the *Koran* had been communicated from above; and they contended, that the most obvious must always be the truest sense. God commanded the faithful to massacre the whole race of unbelievers, and to seize their possessions. This is positively stated in the sacred book; and he must be little better than an Atheist, said the zealous *Mollahs*, who would presume to hold, that this language is figurative and allegorical.

Having decided then that Abdallah was to be denounced as a *Giaur*, the

two *Imams* did not consider it as necessary to be either very attentive to candour, or very scrupulous about fairness, in their mode of attack. *Ge-Douleh*, as *Hogia* to the *Ulemah*, conducted the process. He issued a fulminating manifesto against the astonished Effendi — accused him of denying Mahomet to be the Prophet of God — declared him to be a blasphemer — charged him with reviling the holy *Koran* — called him a *Giaur*, and treated him like a *dog*. The people of Constantinople are, as well as the inhabitants of some other great cities, extremely fond of a little scandal; and are always ready to receive impressions unfavourable to those who have obtained any eminence among

them. Of Abdallah, indeed, they knew little, for he had lived little among them; but his apostacy, though scarcely the subject of "a nine days wonder," was soon propagated and believed throughout the city, with many improvements and additions. It was now confidently reported, that he lived as usual during the *Ramadan* — that he drank the wines of Cyprus — and (*proh pudor!*) frequently dined on the flesh of "the black beast."

The friends of Abdallah in vain endeavoured to stem the torrent. At length one of them wrote and published an answer to *Ge-Douleh*. He admitted that the Effendi had ridiculed the literal

interpretation of some passages in the *Koran*; but he denied that any irreverent expression could be applied to that holy book itself; and he severely commented on the conduct of the *Hogia*, who had traduced Abdallah as a *Giaur*, without being able to produce a single passage which could prove him to disbelieve in the mission of Mahomet, or in the revelation communicated to the world by that Prophet. He insisted upon the right, which every man ought to possess, of giving that sense to the sacred writings, which seems best to his own reason, and most satisfactory to his own conscience, provided that he thereby imputed nothing to the inspired author, which might be unworthy of his

sanctified character. The advocate of Abdallah contended that the scheme of his client, whether erroneous, or not, in its details, contained nothing that was derogatory from the majesty of the Creator, and nothing that was unbecoming of the holiness of the Prophet. Those who are really *Giaurs*, he argued, deny the divine inspiration of the *Koran*, because they take it according to its literal sense, and then assert that they find things in it, which they cannot reconcile to the justice and mercy of the universal Father of the human race. Is he to be branded as an infidel, as an apostate, nay, even as an atheist, who says, that when he meets with such passages as embarrass his reason, and seem

contrary to all his notions of the divine perfection, he thinks it idle, or worse than idle, to adhere to the literal meaning? Abdallah, continued his advocate, has always endeavoured, in his explanations of such parts of the *Koran* as he believed to be really allegorical, to give a sense to them suitable to his humble ideas of the goodness and greatness of God. For this you would drive him from the world as a vile *Giaur*, and as an unprincipled *renegado*! If it must be so, Abdallah will not repine—he will submit to his doom; and will still repeat in his solitude, “*Allah* is just,”

When this vindication of the Effendi appeared, some of the *Ulemah* began to



think that he had been rather harshly treated. But there are certain cases in which it would seem, that accusation and condemnation are synonymous terms. The more moderate and enlightened members of the *Ulema* were compelled to be silent. An *Emir* had nearly had his green turban pulled from his head for extenuating the conduct of the reputed infidel. Some Mollahs, who could not read *his book*, loaded the name of Abdallah with the bitterest and most insulting epithets. — The *Neips* and *Imams* wrote long and angry diatribes against him. — None of these censors would even mention the vindication which had been made for him — and *Ge-Dautch*, as a reward for his piety,

his zeal, his charity, and his fairness, and as an encouragement to all others who might be inclined to persecute *Giaurs*—*Ge-Douleh* was raised to the rank of *Sheik*, or Chaplain, to the *Grand Mufti* himself!

But though flattered by this mark of distinction, yet the *Hogia* could not easily forget, or forgive, the vindication which had appeared in favour of *Abdallah*. His pride was deeply wounded by some expressions, rather indicative of contempt towards himself, which had been employed by the author of the vindication. Impressed with the idea, that this vindication had proceeded from the pen of *Abdallah*, the *Hogia*

soon determined on his plan of revenge. He had already persuaded the Public, that his adversary was a *Giaur*; and while this persuasion existed, *Ge-Dou-leh* knew, that he might safely proceed to assail the moral and the literary character of his foe. He was well aware of the mode, in which his friends the *Neips* would dispose of any justification which could appear in favour of an accused *Giaur*. Another, and a longer manifesto than the former, was now issued against Abdallah by the implacable *Hogia*. He took little notice of the defence which had been made for the Effendi, and attempted not to answer the anonymous author, who had repelled his accusations with the indignation

which their injustice warranted. He tamely submitted to the severe reproofs, which he had received from a writer, who pleaded in behalf of an injured and calumniated individual; and he proceeded to the humane and charitable work of destroying, as far as his means enabled him, the credit of that same individual for truth, for honesty, for talents, and for knowledge. Abdallah, accused of infidelity, was not to be heard, while, through his advocate, he denied the charge to be proved; and his accuser, who was also his judge, passed sentence upon him, from which, in the opinion of *Ge-Douleh*, there lay no appeal. According to him, it became all the faithful to be assured, that Abdallah

XXX

was a *Giaur*, equally vain and stupid; and not to doubt, since it was averred by the *Hogia* himself, that the proofs adduced of the falsehood, impudence, and ignorance of this *Giaur* were incontestable. There could be, or, at least, there ought to be no dispute about the matter, repeated a few servile *Sheiks*, since *Ge-Douleh* tells us, (and who shall question his authority ?) that Abdallah cannot read the Arabic any more than ourselves, and that he is a dunce, a fool, and a liar.

The friends of Abdallah were not intimidated by the abusive and opprobrious terms which the *Hogia*, with so little decency, had applied to him.

They carefully examined these charges of falsehood and ignorance, and the proofs which were brought in support of them. Their indignation was only surpassed by their astonishment, when they discovered, that almost all the specific testimonies adduced against Abdallah betrayed either the most barefaced injustice, or the grossest ignorance, on the part of his accuser. The advocate, who had formerly written in defence of the Effendi, again took up his pen. He has followed the *Hogia* through the first hundred pages of his scurrilous manifesto; and in only one or two examples, out of the very long catalogue of charges, does he admit this self-important personage to be exactly correct. In

many instances he affirms and proves, that *Ge-Douleh* betrays the most contemptible ignorance, mingled indeed with the most consummate arrogance. This advocate does not mean to stop. He has found the subsequent part of the accuser's manifesto to be as weak and as unjust as the commencement; but he has judged it expedient to lose no time in publishing what he has already written in defence of his injured friend.

But while Abdallah has thus been traduced, calumniated, and vilified by an ignorant accuser, this accuser has been promoted for his pious zeal to the rank of *Sheik* to the *Grand Mufti*. This last personage is esteemed for his

virtues; but it has never been surmised, that he was an adept in the Arabic language; and some people have expressed their wonder that he should have given so decided a proof of his opinion on a subject, which has much more to do with grammatical skill in the dialect of the *Koreish*, than with the doctrines of Mahomet. If, however, the present *Ulemah*, the most learned and enlightened body of men in the Ottoman empire, wish to behold at their head a Mussulman with a brazen front and an iron heart, and can desire to witness a renovation of that ferocious and intolerant bigotry, which characterised their unlettered ancestors, they will rejoice at the advancement of the *Hogia*. Who



can doubt, that, if the *Mallahs* and *Imams* should wish it, which, however, we think not very likely, the ignorant and bigoted *Ge-Douleh* may, at length, become their chief, and may one day exercise, to the terror of the *Giaurs*, the formidable powers of the *Grand Mufti*, who wears the largest turban in Constantinople, and who is the only person in the Empire whom the Commander of the Faithful rises to receive.

**SEVEN LETTERS**

**IN ANSWER TO**

**THE REV. MR. D'OYLY;**

***BY VINDEK.***



## POSTSCRIPT.

---

The author of the *Edipus Judaicus* requests such of his friends as may possess that work, to be so obliging as to place this leaf in it, and to make the following corrections.

The definition of the word *paranatellon*, at page xxvii., has been found imperfect, or, at least, obscure. The following is proposed in its place :

An extra-zodiacal constellation may be denominated the paranatellon of a sign under four different circumstances :

1. Any constellation arising from the horizon beside a sign, may be denominated its paranatellon.
2. A constellation rising along with a sign to the meridian, may be called its paranatellon.
3. A constellation may be also termed the paranatellon of a sign, when it rises opposite to it.

4. This name may be given to a constellation rising to the meridian, directly opposite to the sign.

At p. 27. at the words "Perhaps the allusion," &c.— please to read the sentence as follows: "Perhaps the allusion may be to *Centaurus*, followed in his descent by *Scorpius* and the *Adder* his concomitant; but the allusion will also apply to *Hydra*, which sets with *Centaurus*, a paranatellon of *Scorpius*. *At etiam Centaurus occidit cum Hydra*. HYG.

This last sentence was mutilated by the omission of some words in transcribing it from the original copy, which the author has beside him.

Γνωθί νῦν τὰν Οἰδιπόδα σοφίαν.

## LETTER I.

---

SIR,

ANOTHER work of yours upon the *Œdipus Judaicus* was announced as being already in the press about the beginning of the month of February last ; but I am informed, that this work was not published until the commencement of the present month of May. As the mountain appeared to be rather longer in labour than might have been expected, I began to fear that some unlucky accident had befallen the little mouse. My solicitude, however, has been removed within these few days by the kindness of a friend, who has remitted to me your "Re-

“ marks on Sir William Drummond’s *Ædipus*  
*Judaicus*,” being a Sequel to your Letters, &c.

I had the honour of finishing my last letter to you, Sir, by advising you “to preach your doctrines to those who would listen to them, and “to keep your abuse for those who would care “for it.” To part of this advice you have attended, in as much as you have ceased to address yourself directly to Sir W. Drummond; but so far from complying with the latter part of my exhortation, you have spoken of that Gentleman in language yet more scurrilous and vulgar in your “Remarks,” than in your “Letters.” Why a person, who holds the situation of “Christian Advocate in the University of Cambridge,” should have recourse to the lowest and grossest abuse in attacking an adversary, it is not for me to inquire. This is, indeed, a question of taste, of propriety, or of

prudence, which every writer will decide for himself; but I must observe, that insult and invective were not the weapons which the primitive christians were directed to employ against their opponents. They were forbidden to revile their enemies. Their religion breathed nothing but peace, meekness, humility, and charity.—But you, Sir, will perhaps tell me with the physician in Moliere,—*nous avons changé tout cela*.

Before I proceed to a more particular examination of this new Work, which you have published against Sir W. D. I must make a few observations on the extraordinary plan which you have pursued, and which does not evince either all the candour, or all the courage, which might have been expected in a professed champion of the Church. To the Letters which I addressed to you last year, you have made no reply, except very briefly on two or three points,



to which I shall have occasion to advert hereafter. Now, Sir, in those Letters you were charged with having grossly calumniated an individual, and with having, in many and various instances, mistated and misrepresented the meaning of your adversary. You were bearded on your own grounds of theology, and accused of having explained some passages in the Scriptures most absurdly and most ignorantly. It was even very broadly hinted to you, that some of your explanations went to the support of heretical opinions. Witness your maintaining that the appearance of the three *Melachim* to Abraham (Gen. xviii.) was not really the appearance of the triune Jehovah; and that the *Melach-Jehovah*, who appeared to Moses in the burning bush, was only an angel, and not the Lord himself\*. Assuredly, Sir, the Socinians

\* D'Oyley's *Letters*, p. 41.

will thank you for thus lending aid to their cause. You have seen all the cavils, which you had marshalled against your adversary, repelled and baffled—your bigoted and narrow-minded notions exposed and ridiculed—your grovelling scurrilities treated with the contempt which they merited—your malicious accusations proved to be false—your attempts at reasoning, not upon a few, but upon many topics, shewn to be absurd and contemptible—and your answer to all this is confined to two or three points, and to about half-a-dozen pages in a volume, which contains more than two hundred! Questions were left for you to solve, not only with respect to the consistency, but with respect to the *veracity* of several of your statements—and on almost all of these questions you are silent! You find it convenient to abandon the field to *Vindex*, and to commence a fresh attack upon Sir W. D. on other grounds of controversy. But,

Sir, the charges preferred against you by *Vindex* are too grave to be thus lightly passed over. You were accused, and at great length, of having maliciously calumniated an individual—of having attributed to him a system of infidelity which is not even to be found in the book which you so loudly censure—and of having, by gross misrepresentations, and a great deal of dirty cavilling, endeavoured to destroy his character as a man of honour. I believe that most men, and certainly every man who had right feelings, would have thought it incumbent on them fully to meet such charges, before they commenced any new attempt to take away the moral existence of a fellow creature. Happily for Sir W. D., and I suspect for some others, the power in you is not waiting on the will to do mischief.

You will scarcely venture, Sir, to assert that you thought yourself at liberty to take so

little notice of my Letters, because they came from an anonymous writer. You, indeed, tell us in your Preface, that you are assured that this anonymous writer is Sir W. D. himself. Whether you have been quite accurately informed on this subject, or not, is little to the purpose. If ever you attacked Sir W. D. again, you were bound by every principle of justice and honour fully to meet my defence of that gentleman. It signifies not, Sir, who I am. That "*Vindex* had given you some "hard hits," was the expression of a very learned man of your own Profession — That you have been long sore from these hits is pretty evident from the increased malignity with which you now write against Sir W. D. whom you suppose to be the author of these Letters—That you shall have a few more hits, and hard ones too, before I have done with you, I give you, Sir, my very sincere promise.

As you have thus in so dastardly a manner shrunk from the contest with me, and have again attacked Sir W. D. without venturing to give almost any reply to his advocate, I might, perhaps, have been easily excused if I had left you to write dull libels against him until you were tired. Indeed, the many proofs which you have given of your gross ignorance in your last book would have secured you from any further notice from me, if I had not deemed it expedient to rebuke the spirit of malice which lies lurking under the hypocritical cant of the "Christian Advocate." It becomes necessary to touch the toad with the spear of Ithuriel.

In the year 1811 Sir W. D. wrote a few treatises, in which he endeavoured to explain some parts of the Old Testament, by supposing them to be allegorical histories. He had many discussions with his friends on the subject ; and

at length he determined to have his dissertations printed, in order that they might have an opportunity of judging more clearly of his notions. He had written his book with the confidence, and perhaps in some instances with the unguardedness, of a man who addresses a private and well known circle. He spoke freely his opinions of the *literal* interpretation of what he considered to be really meant for allegories. A certain number of copies of his work was given to his friends ; nor did the author imagine, that his book would ever excite attention much beyond the narrow circle for which it was written.

You, Sir, had possibly heard, that Sir W. D. was a man, who dared to think for himself, without the high authority of the Christian Advocate in the University of Cambridge. You contrived (you best know how) to get possession of a copy of the *Œdipus Judaicus* ; and your

selfish policy soon pointed out to you the advantages which you might obtain for your own private views and interests as a priest, by raising the howl of bigotry against a man who possessed some share of reputation in the literary world. There were, indeed, some difficulties which stood in your way. The victim, whom you intended to immolate to selfishness and interest, had done nothing to make himself amenable to the public tribunal. The author of the *Œdipus Judaicus* had not published his volume. He had expressly declared, that it was printed for the perusal of a narrow circle. Nay more, there was not a word said in the whole work against the Christian Revelation. Some ridicule was thrown upon the literal interpretation of some parts of the Old Testament as opposed to the allegorical, and the rest of the work was employed in discussing the nature and object of the allegories introduced by the sacred writers for

the wisest purposes. But these were obstacles, that were to be easily removed by a man of your address. You took it for granted that the book was published—you accused the author of libelling the Clergy—and you charged him with teaching the same doctrines as Dupuis, who denied that Jesus Christ ever existed. After this, Sir, it was easy for you to do any thing ; and that you should employ against the author the powers of that Billingsgate eloquence which you so eminently possess, could no longer excite his wonder,

It was upon this occasion, Sir, that I stepped forwards in defence of Sir W. D. ; and that I strongly remonstrated against your malicious misrepresentations of an unpublished book. The object of your Letters was evidently to destroy the character of Sir W. D. as a man, who possessed any principles either of religion, or of



common honesty ; and, in so doing, to obtain credit to yourself for bringing so heinous a criminal before the bar of the Public. There are certain zealots of your own order, who, you were sure, would join you. The author of the *Œdipus Judaicus* had sneered at the bigots of the present times ; and you accused him of sneering at the Clergy. This was enough for some hot-headed men, who had never seen his book ; and the cry of scandal was quickly raised against him. Far be it from me, Sir, to justify any man, who could speak disrespectfully of the Clergy of the Church of England in general. A more learned body of men exists not in the world ; but that there are some bigots to be found in this numerous and respectable body, I can condemn no man for believing. I should have been the first to have censured the author, if he had spoken irreverently of the Clergy ; but there are individuals belonging to their num-

ber for whom, I avow, for my own part, I can neither feel, nor profess respect. Surely, Sir; you would not expect me to esteem a man merely because he is a priest—and a priest too, who is just what his pride and his interest make him—a bully at Cambridge—a sycophant at Lambeth—and a *Tartuffe* everywhere!

In my Letters addressed to you, I defended Sir W. D. as a man of honour; and I proved to the world that you had most grossly misrepresented his doctrines as being precisely those of Dupuis, since Dupuis denied the truth of the Christian Revelation, and the author of the *Œdipus Judaicus* always speaks of that Revelation in terms of respect. I treated you, it is true, as a meddling, officious, arrogant, and rather ignorant bigot. You deserved, and you met with, my contempt. I laughed in your face, and told you the truth. My sneers at you ren-

dered you furious: you have written another book against Sir W. D. and as it is much longer; so it is incomparably more violent, and more absurd than its predecessor. In your first pamphlet you ventured but a little way upon the grounds of philosophy, science, and learning. For philosophy, you, and many others, seem to have some innate abhorrence; and, therefore, no man, who knows you, will expect you to discourse with him upon general principles of reason. Your views are all partial and limited. You see the little world about you, and you are satisfied with your own knowledge. You sway the opinions of the vulgar; and proscription and persecution await the rash man, who dares to call philosophy his counsellor, and reason his guide. With respect to the sciences, no bigot ever really loved them. To school-learning, you render due homage. It keeps the mind off from speculations, which you fear and abhor.

With this sort of learning I know not, if you individually have had much to do; but the chief design of your last book is to prove, that the author of the *Œdipus Judaicus* is as ignorant of Oriental learning, and of astronomical knowledge, as I ventured to hint to you, you were yourself. In the body of your last book the principal charges are directed against your adversary as a man of letters. You have deserted the main post, where you had stationed yourself before; and now instead of infidelity we hear the cry of ignorance chiefly raised against us. Alas! Sir, though your opponent, yet I cannot help pitying you. How unlucky is the hour for the bigot, when he so far forgets himself as to fight with any other instrument than the terrible weapon of his faith!

I am, Sir,  
Your most humble Servant,

May 19th, 1813.

VINDEX.



## LETTER II.

---

SIR,

IN your Preface to your last libel on the author of the *Œdipus Judaicus*, you inform your reader, “ that it is still your opinion, “ that his plan of converting into allegory the “ hitherto-received histories contained in the “ Hebrew Scriptures, is too obviously absurd to “ be deserving of any regular confutation ; but “ that as you have considered a little more attentively the several parts of his work, you “ have found, connected with his method of “ establishing his allegorical scheme, some

“ statements and positions of a nature so strange  
 “ and singular, that, in common justice to the  
 “ cause of Scripture and of truth, they ought not  
 “ to pass unnoticed.” You add, “ that it has  
 “ occurred to you, also, that his book is calcu-  
 “ lated, and seems intended by the author, to  
 “ produce an effect, by the weight rather of  
 “ authority than of argument ; rather by im-  
 “ posing on the judgment of readers, than by  
 “ convincing their understanding.” You then  
 proceed to observe, that the *Œdipus Judaicus*  
 “ is a work certainly written with great labour,  
 “ and *apparently* the fruit of prodigious erudi-  
 “ tion”—that it will have thus “ obtained the  
 “ confidence of readers in no ordinary degree,  
 “ until some reasons are given for suspecting  
 “ its author of inaccuracy”—and that “ now  
 “ submitting to the public some results of your  
 “ inquiries, your mistake,” you say, “ will be  
 “ great indeed, if you do not produce instances;

“ sufficiently numerous, of ignorance assuming  
 “ the garb of learning, of absurd and inconsis-  
 “ tent attempts at reasoning, of disingenuous  
 “ quotations, and of intrepid ill-grounded asser-  
 “ tions, as to prove beyond all possibility of  
 “ doubt, that the author is totally destitute of  
 “ every quality, which should induce any consi-  
 “ derate reader to place confidence in his autho-  
 “ rity.”

I can scarcely allow myself, Sir, to take  
 notice of your quibbling and inconsistent apology  
 for writing a book against the author's plan,  
 while you tell us in the same breath, that this  
 plan “ is too obviously absurd to be deserving  
 “ of any regular confutation.” It must be evi-  
 dent from your own words, that your chief object  
 in your last publication was to degrade Sir W. D.  
 in the eyes of the world as a man of talents and  
 learning. Before I conclude these Letters, Sir,



my mistake will be great, if I do not prove, that you are entirely deficient in several of those branches of learning, with which you so arrogantly pretend to be conversant, and with which you ought to have been indeed well acquainted, before you charged Sir W. D. with ignorance. That he may have committed some mistakes, in taking so vast a range as he has done, he himself has anticipated ; but unfortunately for you, Sir, your temerity has precipitated you into so many errors, as to show that you were utterly incompetent to accomplish the task which you had undertaken. You pretend, truly, that you wrote your last libel for the sake of truth, and in defence of the Scriptures. *Credat Judæus !* No, Sir. You trusted, that your Letters would have sufficed to have destroyed the reputation of the *Œdipus Judaicus*. You found yourself disappointed. You still met with persons, who spoke of it “ with admiration as a *wonderfully*

“ *clever* book.” Your pride was mortified; and, without considering your means, you sat down to prove to the world that it was in a mistake, and that this same *Œdipus Judaicus*, instead of being a *wonderfully clever* book, was a *wonderfully stupid* one! Who shall dare to doubt, Sir, that you see further into a mill-stone than any body else.†

I come now to consider that part of your Preface, in which you honour *me* with your notice. “It has been asserted broadly and “roundly,” say you, “by an anonymous writer, “(who, I am informed, is no other than Sir “W. D. himself,) that I gave a false representation of the allegorical system, proposed in “the *Œdipus Judaicus*.” Broadly and roundly, Sir, does the same writer repeat the same assertion. You observe, that “while this charge is “boldly made, it is not confirmed by the adduc-

“tion of a single instance ; though you quoted  
 “ the author’s very words, and referred to his  
 “ pages.” But, Sir, I have been accustomed to  
 think, that there may be faults of *omission* as  
 well as of *commission*. Does he fairly state  
 another’s reasoning, who mentions the conclu-  
 sions, and leaves out the premises? Is it candid,  
 is it just, to profess to give an account of a  
 system, and yet to preserve silence on the whole  
 reasoning, and on all the principles, on which it  
 is built? Would it be considered as fair, if a  
 writer, in explaining the system of Berkeley,  
 were to state that that philosopher denied that  
 there was heat in fire, or that his own body  
 existed, without stating how the author explain-  
 ed himself, and without saying a word of the  
 reasoning, by which he came to establish his  
 theory? It is true, that statements of this nature  
 have been frequently made by those who assail-  
 ed Berkeley’s system ; and the vulgar have been

easily led to consider the doctrines of that able metaphysician as the ravings of a madman. But no fair representation of any theory, or system, can possibly be given, while the reasoning and the principles on which it is founded are not fully brought into view. You, Sir, totally neglected in your Letters to take notice of the preliminary part of the dissertation on the Book of Joshua, when you gave your account of the author's system. You stated some of the conclusions to which he had come, but you said nothing of the reasoning from which he had drawn them. You told your readers, that he considered the Book of Joshua to be a string of astronomical allegories, rather than a true and connected history; but you did not say a word of the arguments, by which he had, at great length, supported his hypothesis. Thus I maintain, that you did not give a true representation of the author's system, while you mentioned

some of the conclusions, to which he had come, and forgot to take notice of the premises, whence he had deduced them.

You go on, Sir, to make some further observations, which appear to me to be rather extraordinary. You say, that you “defy any one to comprehend clearly what Sir W. D. means ; for I am sure,” you add, “that he has no such clear comprehension of it himself ; but of this I am perfectly sure, that I endeavoured to understand him rightly and to represent him fairly.” Thus you bravely undertake to endeavour to understand rightly, and to represent fairly an author, whose meaning you defy any one clearly to comprehend. You then tell us, that in your present publication, you “may have varied a little your account of his allegorical scheme ; but since, amidst his contradictory and inconsistent statements, you have

“ been forced to proceed partly by conjecture,  
 “ you know not that you have now come nearer  
 “ to what he calls his true meaning.” In the  
 same page you say, “ it will be almost impossi-  
 “ ble to believe, that any man *possessed of rea-*  
 “ *son* could write such matter as I shall quote.”

Now, Sir, allow me to ask you, whether you believe, that any man, “ possessed of reason,” ever sat down before under such circumstances, to explain, or to give a statement of the system of another. You tell us, that you defy any one clearly to understand the author’s meaning—that he does not understand it himself—that though you may have varied a little in your account of his system, yet as you were forced to proceed partly by conjecture, you know not that you have come nearer to what he calls his meaning than before—and that it will be scarcely possible to believe, that the matter which you

will have to quote could be written by a man in his senses. So then in the perfect possession of your own reason, you propose to give an account of, and to refute a system, while you declare, that the author's meaning is not clearly comprehensible to you, to himself, or to any body else. Again I must ask, whether any man before you ever sat down to write an answer to a book under such circumstances? You seriously undertake to state and refute, (in a pamphlet consisting of more than 200 pages,) the system of an author, whose meaning, according to you, nobody can understand. You are to bring the whole artillery of your logic to bear upon what you treat as a crazy dream—upon matter, which you think it is almost impossible to believe could have been written by a man, who was not out of his wits. Surely this is a most novel and singular method of endeavouring to engage the attention of readers! You gravely propose to them to

criticise and to condemn a work, the meaning of which you defy them clearly to comprehend. You are to show them the fallacy of the author's system, while you proceed by conjecture, and do not know, that you are nearer his meaning now, than when you explained it formerly in another way—and after all the trouble, and all the uncertainty of this process, the matter to be examined has, according to you, the appearance of having been written by a person distracted. This is certainly a most inviting prospect to lay before your readers. It shows too clearly, how well you are acquainted with the arts of allure-ment. To request of the Public to lend you its attention through 200 pages, while you comment on an author whose meaning, you say, is unintelligible, is a proof of modesty and good sense which has never been equalled by *Martinus Scriblerus* himself.



But, Sir, it is very provoking, as you seem bitterly to have felt it, that with all this difficulty of comprehending his meaning, the author of the *Œdipus Judaicus* has still his admirers—persons who think that they understand his meaning, and who have had such inconceivable temerity as to praise his book in your presence. Permit me also to observe, that some censorious people may remark, that if the Christian Advocate at Cambridge employ his time in writing against an author, whose meaning cannot be divined, and whose matter of argument is only worthy of Bedlam, the office of this Christian Advocate is either very useless in itself, or is at present filled by a person who is very ignorant of the duties of his situation.

In the course of these Letters, Sir, I shall have to convict you of much ignorance on subjects of literature and science; but for my own

sake (if it were for nothing else) I shall not treat you as a madman. I could not excuse myself for spending so much time in criticising and attacking a writer, whose meaning nobody could clearly comprehend, and whose productions were the mere ravings of a distempered brain. But, Sir, I cannot help thinking, that the world will be a little apt to suspect your sincerity, while you affect to speak so very contemptuously of the *Œdipus Judaicus*. No man ever wrote two books against one, which he really despised.

You next advert to the defence which has been made for Sir W. D. with respect to his religious opinions. You say, that it has been asserted, that Sir W. D. composed his book with views friendly to revelation; and you observe, that if he himself be a party to this asseveration, he must surely be considered as

adding insult to injury. A long, vague, and turgid *tirade* follows, in which you accuse the author of barlesquing the Scriptures, and of turning the Bible into a mere mass of fable and romance. Not a word, however, do you say in answer to the views, which I have stated, Sir W. D. might have had. No notice is taken by you (worthy man, and candid christian!) of the defence which I made for the author, when I contended, that a man might object to the *literal* interpretation of some parts of the Old Testament, without therefore meaning to defame the character of the Bible itself. What is the state of the case? Sir W. D. understands certain parts and passages in the Old Testament in one sense, and you understand them in another. He says, that by the allegorical interpretation the character of the Scriptures is exalted; and holding that opinion, he ridicules the literal interpretation; because it must happen, that to

him who believes the one mode of interpretation to be true, the other mode must appear to be not only false, but ridiculous. You approve of the literal interpretation; and if you had confined yourself to its defence, and to an attack on the allegorical mode, no person could have complained of your conduct. But you were not to be satisfied with this. You asserted that your opponent was an infidel. Where he ridiculed the literal meaning, you accused him of ridiculing the word of God — the Bible itself; and having once charged him with infidelity, you knew your power. You reviled him in the coarsest terms, and in the rudest language, which bad taste and bigotry could suggest. But, Sir, your vulgarity and malignity shall not deter me from asserting, that while Sir W. D. ridicules the *literal* meaning only; and not only says, but shows, (as in his Dissertation on the Temple,) that the allegorical interpretation

exalts the character of the Scriptures, I shall not admit your charge of infidelity against him, which you have urged for the sole purpose of sanctioning the efforts, which you are making to destroy his reputation as a man of honour, and a man of letters.

In your first libel you accused Sir W. D. of being the disciple of Dupuis, who denied that Jesus Christ was any thing else than a solar symbol, like Osiris, Mithras, Dionysus, &c. I denied on the part of Sir W. D. that he had taught any such doctrine, or that in any part of his work he had employed any term injurious to christianity. I remonstrated with you, at the same time, for thus falsely slandering your adversary; but all that I have obtained from you is what I ought to have expected — another endeavour to propagate the same calumny. I cite the

following note from the tenth page of your  
Preface :

“ \* I wish to direct the reader's attention  
“ to the following passage of the *Œdipus Judai-*  
“ *cus*, p. 368. The author, after stating that the  
“ Bull was worshipped in India long after it  
“ ceased to be the first of the signs, says, ‘ nor  
“ is it less extraordinary that there have been  
“ perhaps more *adorers of the Sun in Aries*, since  
“ that constellation ceased to be the first of the  
“ signs, than there were before.’ I had no con-  
“ ception what he could mean by this sentence,  
“ till M. Dupuis furnished me with a commen-  
“ tary ; for M. Dupuis informs us in various  
“ passages, that ‘ Christ’ is ‘ the Sun in Aries ;’  
“ and that Christians of course are ‘ adorers of  
“ the Sun in Aries.’ Among other instructive  
“ passages to this effect, the reader may digest,  
“ as he can, the following : ‘ Il (le soleil) est

“ aussi Christ, car Christ a tous les traits mer-  
 “ veilleux de Mithra, d’Osiris, &c. On lui  
 “ donne le surnom mystique de Bacchus  $\Upsilon\eta\varsigma$ , que  
 “ les Chrétiens Grècs ont allongé en  $\Upsilon\eta\sigma\omega\varsigma$ .’  
 “ (Orig. de tous les Cultes, v. iii. p. 18.) Again,  
 “ ‘ L’agneau autrement dit Christ.’ (Id. iii. 64.)  
 “ If we must have infidel writers, how truly gra-  
 “ tifying it is to find them holding language of  
 “ such portentous absurdity.”

D’Oyley’s *Preface*, x.

Now, Sir, I conclude that this is the prin-  
 cipal testimony, which you have to adduce, in  
 order to prove, that Sir W. D. is an infidel, who  
 believes with Dupuis, that “Christ is the Sun  
 “ in Aries;” because it may be presumed, that  
 if you had possessed other, or better proofs, you  
 would have produced them. I must, however,  
 tell you, that the passage which you have quoted  
 from the *Œdipus Judaicus* will bear a very dif-

ferent interpretation from what you have given to it; and as I have the following explanation of it from Sir W. D. himself, I shall take the liberty of trusting rather to his authority than to that of the man, who libels him. The following is an extract of a letter from that gentleman :—

“ The worship of the Sun in the sign of  
 “ *Taurus* appears to have been very general  
 “ both in Egypt and in Asia. The symbol of  
 “ the God in Egypt was the *Apis*, or consecra-  
 “ ted Bull. The priests of Egypt were too well  
 “ acquainted with astronomy not to know that  
 “ the Sun had passed into the constellation of  
 “ *Aries*, at the vernal equinox, long after the  
 “ symbol of that luminary in the sign of *Taurus*,  
 “ continued to be revered and adored by the  
 “ vulgar. In the Thebais, and at the Temple  
 “ of Ammon, the Sun, under what had then be-  
 “ come his proper symbol, (namely, that of a



“ Ram,) was principally worshipped. But this  
 “ was by no means the case in other places.  
 “ You well know, that Ammon, whose image,  
 “ with the horns of a Ram on his head, is men-  
 “ tioned in Eusebius, was the symbol of the Sun  
 “ in the sign of *Aries*. When Alexander the  
 “ Great went into Egypt, he proceeded to the  
 “ Temple of Ammon in the desert, and was  
 “ hailed by the priests as the son of their God.  
 “ From this time he assumed divine honors to  
 “ himself, caused himself to be adored, and was  
 “ represented on some of his coins with the  
 “ horns of a Ram. In consequence of Alex-  
 “ ander's calling himself the son of Ammon,  
 “ and requiring to be worshipped as such, it is  
 “ evident that, from this period, Ammon, or the  
 “ symbol of the Sun in *Aries*, would become  
 “ most extensively known, and probably most  
 “ generally adored throughout the whole extent  
 “ of the Macedonian Empire. Alexander pro-

" claimed himself to be the son of Ammon  
 " about 2145 years ago, and consequently just  
 " after the time, when the Sun, at the vernal  
 " equinox, had entered the constellation of  
 " *Pisces*, and *Aries* had ceased to be the first  
 " of the signs. It appears highly probable,  
 " therefore, that what I have stated is histori-  
 " cally true ; and that there really have been  
 " more adorers of the Sun in *Aries*, since that  
 " constellation ceased to be the first of the signs,  
 " than there were before. I can find no traces  
 " of the adoration of Ammon, or of the solar  
 " symbol of the Ram, before the time of Alex-  
 " ander, except in the Thebais, and in the tem-  
 " ple of the desert visited by the Macedonian  
 " conqueror ; but after he had declared himself  
 " to be sprung from Ammon, it may be fairly  
 " presumed that the name of this symbol of  
 " the Sun in the sign of the Ram, became more

“commonly known, and more generally worn  
“shipped.”

Now, Sir, what becomes of the mighty proof by which you are to convict Sir W. D. of holding with Dupuis, that Christ is the Sun in Aries? If you were puzzled by the sentence in question, would it not have been natural for you to have considered what events took place, just after the Sun at the equinox had quitted Aries? You would have found, that Alexander, by calling himself the son of Ammon, must have given universal celebrity to that symbol of the Sun in Aries, and you might have spared yourself the trouble of citing M. Dupuis, in whose works you are so well read. You seem, indeed, to have been aware, that you could not support the charge, when you accused the author of the *Œdipus Judaicus* of teaching the same doc-

trines with Dupuis concerning Christ; and, therefore, you quickly quit this ground. — But the charge was at all events to be made. — It would procure as many enemies for Sir W. D. as there might be Christians who would give it credit.

You next proceed to ask, even if it be allowed to Sir W. D. that he has applied no injurious term to Christianity, what conclusion is to be drawn? The conclusion which you would wish to draw, is, that Sir W. D. “thinks  
 “ that he can spread his infidel notions with  
 “ more effect and success, by assailing, in the  
 “ first instance, the Old Testament, instead of  
 “ the New.” “I leave the reader,” say you,  
 “ to his own judgment; only desiring him to  
 “ recollect that, if Sir W. D.’s insinuations and  
 “ assertions respecting the Old Testament be  
 “ indeed well-founded, the Christian Evange-

“ lists and Apostles have committed the grossest  
 “ errors ; have mistaken astronomical allegories  
 “ for real histories ; and have referred to books  
 “ of mere romance and fable, as to books which  
 “ claim divine authority for their unmixed  
 “ truth.”

Really, Sir, this is a pleasant way of leaving  
 the reader to his own judgment ; and surely if  
 all reasoning consisted in positive dogmatical  
 assertions, there would be no man whose logic  
 could be more convincing than yours. As I  
 have many other questions to discuss with you,  
 I shall for once adopt your style, and without  
 stopping to reason about the matter, shall tell  
 you, that I defy you to prove from the New Tes-  
 tament, that a considerable part of the histories  
 related in the Pentateuch, and in the Books of  
 Joshua and Judges, are not allegories. That  
 the outline of the history, from the calling of

Abraham, is according to truth, the author of the *Œdipus Judaicus* does not deny; while he argues that the early parts of that history contain, and are mingled with, much matter, that is merely typical, symbolical, and allegorical. According to your sweeping sentence, no room is left for explaining the books in question by the help of allegory; and he who adopts the allegorical interpretation, imputes the grossest errors to the writers of the New Testament. But this I deny; and I maintain that those Fathers of the Church, who so frequently had recourse to the allegorical system, were, *at least*, as fit judges of the matter as you are,

I come now, Sir, to consider the defence which you make for attacking an unpublished book; and I think your language upon this subject shows you to be a complete dogmatist. You affirm;

that the *Cædipus Judaicus* is published. Who published it? Was it ever advertised? Was it ever to be had for sale? Was it ever in the hands of a Bookseller? Does the author admit, that he ever intended it for publication?—You say it is published in the contemplation of the law. What do you know about law? You say, that the author printed as large an edition of his book, as if he had intended it for sale; and distributed his copies gratuitously, by means of himself, his printer, and the friends of both. Who would conceive from this statement what is the real truth? The whole number of copies printed amounted to 250. Of these about 30 copies (the author thinks) were given to his friends, with most of whom he had been conversing on the subject of his speculations. Some of these copies were, however, certainly sent to other friends with whom he had not any such

conversations ; and it is even possible, that two or three copies may have been given away by the printer, "though of this," says Sir W. D., "I have no evidence." It is likewise to be observed, that of these copies the greater number had been already solicited by persons, who knew that the book was printing. Soon after this period, the book came to be more generally spoken of than the author expected. Some copies, (besides those already mentioned,) perhaps a dozen, were at this time in the possession of a friend ; but the author requested of that friend to give none of them away, without satisfying himself, that this mark of confidence would not be abused ; and he has every reason to believe that this injunction was attended to. From this period, no copies, the author firmly believes, have been given away, except at the solicitation of those many respectable and learned persons, who have demanded them. Now, Sir, how,



under these circumstances can you presume to say, that the *Œdipus Judaicus* has been gratuitously distributed—nay even thrust upon those who possess it? How can you venture to assert that this book is published? The author, the printer, and the friends of both, will assert in contradiction to you, that the whole bearing of your statement is erroneous. The *Œdipus Judaicus* did attract much curiosity. The printer will tell you, that in less than six months after it was printed, he wrote to the author to inform him, that if it had been for sale he could have sold *a thousand* copies. What has this same printer told you within this month, nearly two years from the time when the book was printed? He has told you, (to your disgrace be it spoken,) that *one hundred* copies still remained in his hands. Two hundred and fifty copies of a book are printed. Had this book been for sale, a thousand

copies, had they existed, would have been sold in six months. One hundred and fifty copies are only given away (far the greater portion having been solicited) in a space of about twenty months ; and yet you come forward, and charge the author with gratuitously distributing, and industriously circulating his work ! Is it really to be endured, in a country which calls itself free, that such a busy-body should think himself intitled, under such circumstances, to proclaim of his own authority, that a book is published, and then calumniate the author, the printer, and the friends of both ?

But you do not stop here. “ To show,” say you, “ that there has been no undue backwardness in the distribution, I wish to state, that the book has been in some instances *returned* to the author, by persons to whom it had been

“most officiously sent.” Now what does Sir William Drummond tell me? “If,” says he, “the book had been in *some* instances returned to me, I must, I should think, have known it, and have received one, or other, of these returned copies. In direct contradiction to Mr. D’Oyley’s statement, I declare to you upon my honor, that I have never heard of the return of a single copy of my book, and that *no copy has ever been returned to me.*” Answer this, Sir; or acknowledge to the world, that, if you did not invent, you have too rashly repeated, so erroneous an opinion.

I am, &c.

**VINDEX.**

### LETTER III.

---

SIR,

THE first chapter of your last book contains your attack against Sir W. Drummond's dissertation on the Book of Joshua. The account, which you give of his allegorical interpretation, differs from that contained in your Letters—and is more extended than your former statement; but still you choose to suppress any mention of the reasoning, which the author employed, and upon which his system is built. Your object in doing so is sufficiently obvious. The author is at great pains to show, that his interpretation accords not only with probability,

but answers well to the great purposes, which the sacred writers may have had in view. He contends, that these writers desired to reclaim the Hebrews from idolatry—that all idolatry in those times consisted in the worship of the Sun, the Moon, and the Stars, and their symbols and images—that this profane worship was intimately connected with a false system of astronomy—and that, therefore, it was extremely probable, that the errors of that astronomical system should be pointed out by those, who endeavoured to recal the people from their idolatrous practices. The author's reasoning upon this point, in the dissertation before us, is carried on for nearly forty pages ; but has not been honored by your notice, as it might have led some persons to question, whether, or not, you were quite accurate in stating, that “ his principal object ~~must~~ have been to degrade the “ Bible in public estimation.”

But there is, perhaps, another reason, why you have chosen to take no notice of the preliminary reasoning contained in this dissertation. To the mass of readers, who may take up your book, it may be convenient to insinuate, that your candor would have induced you to consider your opponent "as laboring under a literary "lunacy," if it had not been for certain "blasphemous burlesque of the very words of Scripture which pervades his preface." Thus you mildly and charitably leave it to your readers to believe, that you have proved the author of the *Œdipus Judaicus* to be either a lunatic, or a blasphemer; and as you carefully conceal the account, which he himself gives of his system, you can reckon comfortably enough on your own success, in thus misrepresenting and libelling the writer of an unpublished work. Let me tell you, however, that if there be that spirit of fair-

ness, which I am persuaded exists in the public mind, your triumph will be short. Let any impartial man of your own profession examine the defence, which I made in my former Letters, of the expressions to which you object as being blasphemous, and then judge, whether, or not, that defence should be passed over, as if it had never been made. As for the charge of lunacy, which you seem willing to bring against the author, it may do for the very lowest of the vulgar, and for the maddest among mad bigots. — The rest of the world would only laugh at you for it, if it were possible for us to retain our human nature, and at the same time laugh at the dark workings of revenge and malevolence.

You reject, if I understand you rightly, the allegorical interpretation of the Book of Joshua, proposed by the author of the *Œdipus Judaicus*, on the following grounds:—

1. The Scriptural books, of which we are treating, (the Pentateuch, the Book of Joshua, &c.) have never before been considered as allegorical.

2. If the Book of Joshua be not admitted as a true history, neither can the histories of the Greeks and Romans be allowed to be true ; and the history of the Peloponnesian war may be as justly suspected, as the history of the establishment of the Hebrews in the land of Canaan.

3. The author of the *Œdipus Judaicus* is utterly unable to render his allegorical scheme either clear, or consistent ; and when his proposed alterations are introduced into the text, the whole becomes a farrago of absurdity.

4. The author of the *Œdipus Judaicus* is grossly ignorant of the Hebrew.



These, Sir, are, I think, the most prominent grounds, which you have taken. We shall soon see, whether you will be able to keep them, or whether you will be driven back from them with disgrace.

1. You set out with stating, that the books in question were written, (according to what you believe to be the best authority,) above 3000 years ago; and you add, "we have not the most distant reason for thinking, that the idea of considering these narratives to be allegorical, was ever conceived by any persons to whom they have been known, Jews, Christians, Mahometans, or Pagans, during any part of the 3000 years, before the present time." So then Philo-Judæus, the most learned of all the Jewish writers, and Origen, one of the most celebrated Fathers of the Christian Church, never discovered that there was any thing allegorical in the

first Books of the Old Testament. But this is so evidently said, in order to mislead unlearned readers, that I shall take no further notice of it. With the argument this has really little to do. If the notion were a new one, which it is not, its novelty could be no rational objection to it; or, at least, no better than that which was urged by the bigots against the Copernican system. Your argument plainly goes to this, that no opinion of old standing, and which is generally received, ought to be disputed. The principle is the same with that upon which the inquisitors acted, when they sent Galileo to prison, for saying that the Earth turned round the Sun. Error may be more difficult to detect, where it is ancient and general; but in the eyes of the philosopher it will not, on that account, be more respectable. Its novelty could be no just objection against the allegorical interpretation, even if this mode of interpretation were new, which it is not; but

I will confess, that, in recommending it, the author of the *Œdipus Judaicus* ought to have recollected the answer, which was given to a critic by the old monk, who was in the daily habit of reading *mumpsimus* for *sumpsimus* in his breviary,

You employ one very curious argument to prove, that these ancient books have always been considered as purely historical, without any mixture of allegory. "The LXX, and other translators of the Bible," say you, "believed these narratives to be historical, for they translate them in a way which leaves no possible doubt of their opinion." What is this way? They translate them, generally speaking, with fidelity. But how does this prove, that the LXX, and other translators, did not consider that the narratives in question were not mixed with allegories? They have translated Solo-

mon's Song, and the Book of Judith, as faithfully as the Pentateuch ; and yet the first of these is an allegorical composition from beginning to end, and the second is a mere fable.

Your appeal to the testimony of St. Stephen and St. Paul is nothing to the purpose, since that testimony only proves that the general outline of the history is true, while it does not authorise us to deny, that allegories were mingled with the ancient narratives of the first sacred writers.

2. But you contend, that if this allegorical system can be applied to the Book of Joshua, and if that Book be not admitted to contain a true narrative, we may then dispute the truth of any ancient history whatever. If the fact, (you argue,) that the Book of Joshua has been for 3000 years admitted to be historical, do not prove it to be such, what proof have we that

the writings of Thucydides convey a history of the Peloponnesian war, or those of Livy of the Roman state? Why, Sir, my answer upon this point will not detain me long. There is such a thing as internal evidence, to which I suppose every critic is accustomed to look. In the writings of Thucydides we find a narrative of events, which is generally consistent with probability. He makes no extravagant demands upon our imagination, at the expense of our reason. He wrote of events which passed in his own time; and his contemporaries were the judges of his accuracy. His history was not locked up. It was read by the most enlightened people of the world; and their most celebrated orator is said to have known it by heart. When I turn to the pages of Livy, I find the case to be very different; and there are parts of his history, which I do not hesitate to reject as mere romance and fable. It is true, indeed, that as

the narrative of that great historian approaches more nearly to his own times, it becomes gradually marked with the character of truth; but who can place much faith in the early chronicles of Rome, in which the boundaries between truth and fiction are often so indistinct, as to render it difficult, if not impossible, always to recognize them? The blame, however, is not with Livy. He reports the ancient traditions; but he does not require us to believe, that Romulus and Remus were really suckled by a wolf, or that the Goddess Egeria paid nocturnal visits to Numa Pompilius.

Thus the reader of the Greek and Roman historians exercises his judgment, and hesitates not to reject any tradition, which is contrary to probability, to experience, and to common sense. He may admit, that the general outline of Livy's History of the Kings of Rome is con-

sonant with truth ; but he will scarcely allow himself to believe, that Romulus was miraculously translated to heaven, that a shower of stones fell upon mount Albanus in the reign of Tullus Hostilius, and that a celestial voice was heard to issue from the grove on the summit of the hill.

When we come to look to internal evidence for the truth of the history of the Book of Joshua, we must confess that our path is obstructed by some stumbling blocks of no ordinary magnitude. The walls of a fortified city are said to have fallen down in consequence of a company of priests blowing their trumpets—The Sun and Moon are represented as being made to stand still, and both at mid-day, over a hill and a valley in Palestine, while the Hebrews finished their work of carnage—A numerous army, we are told, was destroyed by

a shower of stones which fell from heaven—and the all-just and merciful God is stated to have ordered the entire extirpation of seven nations, in order to make room for the Israelites, who were commanded to butcher them, and seize their property. Now, Sir, these accounts have appeared to various persons, (to some sincere Christians, I believe, as well as to Deists,) to be so monstrous and extravagant, as to induce them to call in question the authenticity of this extraordinary history. They say that it is by the aid of reason, that they have proved to themselves, that a God exists. Reason is then the very foundation of their religion; and if they reject the use of reason, and admit as true what is absurd, or contradictory, or impossible, they destroy the basis upon which their belief in a Deity is built. If we once allow that religion and reason can be separated from each other, we resign the only means by which man can distin-



guish between truth and falsehood—between the religion that is true, and the religion that is false. In fact, the person, who does not exercise the reason which God has given him in the guidance of his faith, will be a Pagan, a Mahometan, a Christian, a Papist, a Lutheran, or a Calvinist, as chance may direct, and as example may determine.—For the religious opinions of how many millions can we safely answer by a reference to geography. Why, then, say these persons, who deny the Book of Joshua to contain an authentic narrative of real events, will you insist on our giving up the use of our reason to such a point, as to believe that impossibilities have taken place? It is a physical impossibility, that the Moon at mid-day should be standing over a valley, in the vicinity of which was a mountain over which the Sun was standing still. It is a physical impossibility, that the Sun could have stood still over any place in Palestine: a line

drawn from the earth's centre to the Sun would pass through no part of Judea. Then it is evident, that Joshua should have commanded the Earth to stand still, and not the Sun---&c. &c.

The author of the *Œdipus Judaicus*, having had to reason with some of these persons, and feeling that he could not argue for the existence of impossibilities, steps forward, and says, that the language of this book is allegorical, and that to understand it literally is not to do justice to its author, who probably wrote it for the purpose of instructing the Priests in some branches of learning, which in Egypt and in Chaldea were carefully concealed from the vulgar. You rush out upon him, accoutered in a lion's skin, and betray yourself by the clamor which you make. But I leave it to others to decide between the three parties, which are here in dispute. The first party holds, that the Book of Joshua is not

a true history, but a collection of fabulous and absurd traditions.—The second party devotes the first to the infernal abodes, and maintains that the Book in question is a true and authentic history, and that every Christian is bound to consider it as such.—The third, and smallest party denies that a Christian is bound to receive this Book as an authentic history; admits that some of the narratives contained in it are absurd and incredible, if literally understood; but asserts that these narratives are chiefly allegorical, and should not, therefore, be interpreted according to the letter. Which of these modes of considering the question is most agreeable to reason, let the critics determine.

Pour moi sur cette mer qu'ici bas nous courons,  
 Je songe à me pourvoir d'esquif et d'avirons;  
 A régler mes désirs, à prévenir l'orage,  
 Et sauver, s'il se peut, ma raison du naufrage.

3. You, Sir, are violently angry at the idea of its being thought possible, that any part of the historical narrative in the Old Testament should be considered as bearing an allegorical sense. Upon this subject you seem to differ from St. Paul, who tells the Galatians, (c. iv.) that a very remarkable part of that narrative is an allegory. “ For it is written, that Abraham  
 “ had two sons ; the one by a bond-maid, the  
 “ other by a free-woman. But he who was of  
 “ the bond-woman was born after the flesh :  
 “ but he of the free-woman was by promise.  
 “ Which things are an ALLEGORY ; for these  
 “ are the two covenants ; the one from the  
 “ mount Sinai, which gendreth to bondage,  
 “ which is Agar. For this Agar is mount Sinai  
 “ in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which  
 “ now is, and is in bondage with her children,  
 “ But Jerusalem which is above, is free, which  
 “ is the mother of us all.” Such are the words

of St. Paul, and yet you positively assert that we have no reason to think, that the idea of considering the historical narratives contained in the Old Testament to be allegorical, was ever conceived by any person before the present time! In how many instances are we to find, that though the Christian Advocate may have taken his fee, he has forgotten his brief?

But according to you, the scheme of allegorizing the Book of Joshua, proposed by the author of the *Edipus Judaicus*, is most absurd and irrational, and would render that Book a mere farrago of nonsense. In order to convince your readers of the truth of this assertion, you cite certain portions from the Book in question, and then you repeat these portions, changing the proper names to the objects supposed by the author to be generally symbolized by these names. Thus you quote the first words of the

first chapter—" Now after the death of Moses  
 " the servant of the Lord, it came to pass, that  
 " the Lord spake unto Joshua, the son of Nun,  
 " Moses's minister, saying, Moses my servant is  
 " dead : now, therefore, arise, go over this Jor-  
 " dan, &c." For the purpose of showing that  
 the astronomical objects, supposed by the author  
 of the *Œdipus Judaicus* to be symbolized by  
 many of the proper names in this Book, cannot  
 be so understood, and that his explanations of  
 them are totally absurd, you then write the  
 words — " Now after the death of Moses, the  
 " servant of the Lord, it came to pass that the  
 " Lord spake unto the Sun in the sign of Aries,  
 " (which constellation rises above the Whale,)  
 " Moses's minister, saying, Moses my servant  
 " is dead : now, therefore, arise, go over this  
 " ecliptic, &c." You add, " it may not be too  
 " much to say, that there never was a more  
 " complete farrago of absurdity." This, Sir,

shall be fully admitted to you ; but when you ascribe this farrago to the author of the *Œdipus Judaicus*, you attribute to him the precious workings of your own brain ; an honor, which, he assures me, he must decline accepting.

I have been accustomed to derive the word *allegory* from ἄλλο ἀγορεύειν, and to fancy, that it was a figure of speech, by which a writer conveyed one meaning, while he seemed to announce another. It was, therefore, really in allegory, that the Priests and Philosophers of antiquity, who wished to veil their knowledge and mystical notions from the people, were generally in the habit of speaking.—Allegory was the language of the double doctrine—It conveyed the esoteric sense to the learned ; while the exoteric meaning was alone obvious to the multitude. It was in this language, that the Priests of Chaldea and of Egypt, and even

some of the Philosophers of Greece (especially the Pythagoreans), were accustomed to discourse. These persons, indeed, seem to have commonly both written and spoken by the help of symbols, the tropical, the enigmatical, &c. Allegory was the language of the Phœnician work of Sanchoniatho — this was the language of the Zendavesta attributed to Zoroaster — of the books ascribed to Thoth — of the Indian Vedas — and, as the author of the *Œdipus Judaicus* thinks, of a considerable portion of the Hebrew Scriptures.

After knowledge came to be more generally diffused, this allegorical manner of speaking and writing — this mode of conveying one sense to a few, while another was understood by the multitude — soon fell into disuse. Allegory ceased to be employed, unless it were to embellish the style of the poet or the orator; and



as taste improved, both writers and speakers became more severe in their use of it. In ancient Egypt, and in Asia, allegory was really what its etymology shows it to have been first considered by the Greeks—any mode of speaking, which conveyed another sense than that which was apparently expressed — which said one thing, and signified another ; but in modern times the meaning of the word seems to be taken in a more limited sense ; and our critics generally define allegory to be a continued metaphor, also limiting the sense of this last word, in a way that Aristotle would scarcely have understood.

But it must be plain, that those who wrote in allegory according to its original sense, and who made use of it in order to convey a certain meaning to the learned, while they were telling quite another story to the multitude, would

employ only such hints and symbols, as might be necessary to their design. They would never suppose, that any person among the learned, to whom they intended to convey a secret meaning, would be quite so stupid and asinine, as to insist upon their connecting the allegorical symbols by the help of the literal meaning ; and still less would they expect, that the thing symbolized should be put into the place of the symbol, and then understood as forming part of the literal signification. Now, Sir, this is precisely what you have done. It happens, however, that no allegory could possibly stand such a test. Let us begin by taking examples of this figure, when its limits became restricted, and when it may be properly defined a continued metaphor,

O Navis, referent in mare te novi

Fluctus : O quid agis ? fortiter occupa

Portum : nonne vides, ut

Nudum remigio latus,

Et malus celeri sancius Africo,  
 Antennæque gemant? ac sine funibus  
 Vix durare carinæ  
 Possint imperiosius  
 Æquor? &c.

Here a *ship* is the symbol, and *the Roman Republic* the thing symbolized. Write *respublica* for *navis*, and Horace's Ode becomes nonsense from beginning to end.

Ovid gives the following account of the *rape of Proserpine*;

Perpetuum ver est, quo dum Proserpina luco  
 Ludit, et aut violas, aut candida lilia carpit;  
 Dumque puellari studio calathosque sinumque  
 Implet, et æquales certat superare legendo;  
 Pene simul visa est, dilectaque, raptaque Diti.

A learned writer, who agrees in this with most mythologists, tells us, that Pluto was the

type of the Winter Sun, and that Proserpine ravished by Pluto means the corn which remains concealed during the Winter. But if you render Proserpine "corn" and Pluto "the Winter Sun," in the verses just cited, you will make Ovid talk nonsense, and your undergraduates will laugh in your face.

Dryden writes, in an allegory which is not very well sustained,

A milk-white hind, immortal and unchanged,  
Fed on the lawns, and in the forests ranged.

By this milk-white hind, it is well known, he typified the Church of Rome. What would become of poor Dryden, not otherwise very happy in his allegory, if we were to follow your canons of criticism. We must then substitute the thing symbolized for the symbol, and con-

founding the allegorical with the literal expressions, we must read—

*The Church of Rome*, immortal and unchanged,  
Fed on the lawns, and in the forests ranged.

Thus, Sir, in these three examples you would perfectly succeed, in making Horace, Ovid, and Dryden, produce “a farrago of absurdity;” — for it is quite certain, that *Republics* do not go to sea, either with, or without, oars, masts, or sails — that *corn* does not gather flowers, and put them into baskets — that the *Winter Sun* does not fall in love, any more than the Summer Sun — and that Churches neither feed on lawns, nor range in forests !

It was the opinion of the great Bacon, that the mythological stories of the Pagan writers were generally allegories. He led the way; and has been followed by learned Europe in this

path, as well as in many others. It was, indeed, in the spirit of allegory, according to which, says Plutarch, "one thing is related, and another thing is understood," that the Priests of Egypt taught their sublime theology. The Sun was considered by them as the type of the active — and the Earth as the type of the passive principle in nature. The Moon, likewise, as receiving her light from the Sun, and as being guided in her motions by a joint attraction, was another symbol of the passive principle. Hence, if we wish to comprehend the ancient mythologists, we must ever keep in view their allegorical system. The day is past, when it was vainly pretended that Hero-worship was the origin of Pagan mythology. History, both sacred and profane, proves beyond a doubt, that the Tsa-baists were the first idolators. Now let us turn to some of those mythological stories, which the Greeks obtained from Egypt and the East ; and

mythologists agree in referring this labor to the Sun's passage through the sign of *Leo*. The story, as collected from the ancients, may be summed up in a few words, "The first labor imposed upon Hercules, by Eurystheus, King of Argos, was to kill the Nemean Lion, which infested the country near *Mycenæ*. Hercules failed in killing the Lion with his arrows; but attacked him with his club; and having pursued him to his den, throttled the monster with his hands. He carried the dead animal to *Mycenæ*; and ever after cloathed himself with the skin of this tremendous wild beast."

I take this, with little variation, from a book just put into my hands by a school-boy, and which, I believe, is a very good one for *him*. But what will become of the mythologists in the eyes of the school-boy, if he apply to your canons of criticism? This school-boy will infallibly decide, that the mythologists are all fools, or mad,

men. — According to your rules, he will read the foregoing passage, as explained by the mythologists, in the following instructive manner. —

“ The first labor imposed upon *the Sun*, by

“ Eurystheus, King of Argos, was to kill *the*

“ *sign of Leo*, which infested the country near

“ Mycenæ. *The Sun* failed in killing *the sign*

“ *of Leo* with his arrows ; but attacked *it* with

“ his club ; and having pursued *it* to *its* den,

“ throttled the *constellation* with his hands.

“ *The Sun* carried the dead *sign* to Mycenæ ;

“ and ever after cloathed himself with the skin

“ of this tremendous wild *partition of the*

“ *zodiac*.” The school-boy, (I suppose him a very young one), having thus assailed the mythologists with weapons taken from your critical armoury, might exclaim with as much reason as you do, “ it may not be too much to say, that

“ there never was a more complete farrago of

“ absurdity than this.” The mythologists,



however, if they deigned to take notice of him, would tell the school-boy, that the farrago was of his own making — and that by not knowing how to distinguish between what might be original, and what might be adventitious — between what might belong to allegory, and what might be superinduced by fable and romance — in a word, between what was intended to instruct the learned, and what was merely meant for the amusement of the vulgar ; he had confounded the figurative and the literal meanings with each other ; had jumbled the enigmatical with the apparent sense ; and had totally mistaken and misconceived the subject, of which he was so pertly prating.

But leaving the mythology of the Pagans, let us turn to the pages of the Holy Bible. I find that the commentators have not hesitated to admit, that this sacred book contains many

allegories. Thus the *Song of Songs* is generally supposed to be an allegory, descriptive of the mystical union, and the ineffable love, which exist between Christ and his Church. Let us follow your plan, and substitute the things symbolized, wherever the symbols occur, and we should render this Song of Songs, not only a farrago of absurdity, but an intolerable compound of blasphemy and indecency. But what commentator would allow, that the things symbolized should be so introduced ; and then the meaning continued in the literal sense ? — It is agreed, that Christ is typified by the lover, and the Church by his spouse ; — but what Christian would tolerate it, if we were to put Christ and the Church for the lover and the spouse, and then attribute the words literally to Christ and the Church, which are employed by the lover and the spouse ? By substituting that which is symbolized for the symbol, we should

make Christ say, according to the Vulgate, *Comedite amici, et bibite, et inebriamini charissimi!* and we should attribute the following words to the Church, *Dilectus meus (i. e. Christus) misit manum suam per foramen, et venter meus intremuit ad tactum ejus!*

I have already quoted the words of St. Paul ; but I shall again repeat them. “ For it is written, “ that Abraham had two sons ; the one by a “ bond-maid, the other by a free-woman. But “ he who was of the bond-woman was born “ after the flesh ; but he of the free-woman was “ by promise. Which things are an *allegory* ; “ for these are the two covenants ; the one from “ the mount Sinai, which gendreth to bondage, “ which is Agar. For this Agar is mount “ Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem “ which now is, and is in bondage with her “ children. But Jerusalem which is above, is

“ free, which is the mother of us all.” (Gal. ch. iv.) Now, Sir, what would become of St. Paul’s consistency, if your mode of criticising were really legitimate? I maintain, that upon your principles, the Apostle has rendered the text of Moses “ a farrago of absurdity.” But let us take another specimen of the mode, in which you would force upon the author of the *Œdipus Judaicus* a version of the Book of Joshua altogether extravagant and irrational. The text runs literally thus — “ And Joshua, the  
 “ son of Nun, sent out of Shittim two men to  
 “ spy secretly, saying, go view the land, even  
 “ Jericho; and they went, and came unto an  
 “ harlot’s house, named Rahab, and lodged  
 “ there, &c.” According to your scheme, of the value of which I have already given some proofs, you proceed to place the things symbolized for the symbols, and then to connect the allegorical types by the literal meaning. You

consequently produce the following specimen of your ingenuity—"The Sun in Aries sent  
 " out of the heavens two men (meaning two  
 " days added to the lunar months) to spy  
 " secretly, saying, go view the land, even the  
 " moon (or the lunar months); and they went,  
 " and came into an harlot's house named  
 " 'Space, or Latitude,' and lodged there, &c."

Now let us apply your critical text to the words of St. Paul. The Apostle says clearly enough, that the narrative of Abraham's having had two sons by a bond-woman and by a free-woman, is an allegory;—that these two sons are the two covenants;—that Agar, or Hagar, the bond-woman, is mount Sinai in Arabia, answering to the terrestrial Jerusalem;—and that Sarah, the free-woman, is the heavenly Jerusalem, the mother of us all. This is, I think, distinctly enough the statement of St. Paul; and he makes a sublime allegory of the narrative in Genesis,

But now let us apply your farrago-forcing system to the words of the Apostle of the Gentiles.

Moses says (Gen. xxi) “ And the Lord  
 “ visited Sarah as he had said, and the Lord  
 “ did unto Sarah as he had spoken. For Sarah  
 “ conceived, and bare Abraham a son in his old  
 “ age, &c.” “ And Abraham circumcised his  
 “ son Isaac being eight days old, &c.” “ And  
 “ Sarah said, God hath made me to laugh, so  
 “ that all that hear will laugh with me: and she  
 “ said, who would have said unto Abraham,  
 “ that Sarah should have given children to  
 “ suck? &c.” “ And the child grew, and was  
 “ weaned, &c.” “ And Sarah saw the son of  
 “ Hagar the Egyptian, which she had borne  
 “ unto Abraham, mocking. Wherefore she  
 “ said unto Abraham, cast out this bond-  
 “ woman, &c.” “ And Abraham rose up early

“ in the morning, and took bread, and a bottle  
 “ of water, and gave it unto Hagar (putting it  
 “ on her shoulder) and the child, and sent her  
 “ away, &c. &c.”

By the light of your luminous criticism, Sir,  
 St. Paul must have read those words as follows,  
 (just as certainly as the author of the *Ædipus*  
*Judaicus* must have read the Book of Joshua  
 in the mode which you are pleased to prescribe  
 to him.)

“ And the Lord visited *Jerusalem which is*  
 “ *above* as he had said, and the Lord did unto  
 “ *Jerusalem which is above* as he had spoken.  
 “ For *Jerusalem which is above* conceived, and  
 “ bare Abraham *one of the two Covenants* in his  
 “ old age, &c.” “ And Abraham circumcised  
 “ *this Covenant* being eight days old, &c.”  
 “ And *Jerusalem which is above* said, God hath

“ made me to laugh, so that all that hear  
 “ will laugh with me. And she said, who  
 “ would have said unto Abraham, that *Jerusalem*  
 “ *which is above* should have given young Cove-  
 “ nants to suck? &c.” “ And the young Cove-  
 “ nant grew, and was weaned, &c.” “ And  
 “ *Jerusalem which is above* saw the Covenant of  
 “ *Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answering to Jeru-*  
 “ *salem which now is, and is in bondage,* mock-  
 “ ing. Wherefore she said unto Abraham,  
 “ Cast out *this Mount Sinai in Arabia,* &c.”  
 “ And Abraham rose up early in the morning,  
 “ and took bread, and a bottle of water, and  
 “ gave it unto *Mount Sinai in Arabia* (putting  
 “ it on *its* shoulder) and the *young Covenant,*  
 “ and sent it away, &c. &c.”!!!

Such is the “farrago of absurdity,” which,  
 upon your principles of criticism, *must* be im-  
 puted to St. Paul. If the test, by which you



would try the allegories understood by the author of the *Œdipus Judaicus*, be just, then this test applied to the words of St. Paul render them altogether irrational—Festus was unquestionably in the right; and the Apostle may be pitied “as labouring under a literary lunacy.” But I maintain, that this test of yours is altogether false, and contrary to every principle of sound criticism. A more miserable abortion, indeed, was never produced by an unlawful commerce between malice and dulness.

4. You proceed in the next place to charge Sir W. D. with gross ignorance of the Hebrew. This, Sir, I think, will not be very easily credited by those, who know any thing either of him, or of you. I cannot, indeed, quite comprehend, how you could venture upon such an accusation. You are yourself utterly ignorant of the elements of Hebrew. How then could you think of

undertaking to criticise the labors of Sir W. D. in this department of literature? Did you think, that your book would not be answered? Did you imagine, that your proofs would not be examined? In order to show you, that I am not alone, in thinking thus contemptuously of your knowledge of Hebrew, I shall cite (with the permission of Sir W. D.) a few passages from a letter, lately addressed to him by one of the first Hebrew scholars in England.

“ On reading Mr. D’Oyley’s second production,” says this gentleman to Sir W. D., “ I could not avoid feeling sensibly on your account, because he has forgotten what is due to the character of the *Christian Advocate*,— thrown aside the mask of gentleman — and in the most unqualified manner, altogether unmerited, attacked you with all that bitterness of soul, which only characterises the spirits

“ of the bottomless pit : but when this is done,  
 “ *accompanied with the most profound ignorance*  
 “ *of Hebrew learning*, it is shocking and unbear-  
 “ able.” Such, Sir, is the opinion formed of  
 you by this learned Hebraist.

I shall prove to you in this letter, that you  
 had better have taken the hints which I gave  
 you last year, and have studied the Oriental  
 languages before you attacked the author of the  
*Œdipus Judaicus* upon that subject. Out of  
 the vast number of names explained in the  
 work, you have taken about a dozen examples,  
 in which you say the author has betrayed gross  
 ignorance of the Hebrew. Had the author  
 really been guilty of as many mistakes as you  
 charge him with, I should have thought it not  
 altogether unpardonable in so large a volume ;  
 but what will be thought of you, Sir, and of your  
 arrogant pretensions, when I shall have proved,

as I certainly shall prove, that in most of the instances you are entirely and palpably in the wrong? I shall follow you through every word, and shall subjoin either my own remarks, or those of the Hebraist just mentioned, or those of Sir William Drummond, as I shall judge expedient.

1. The author of the *Œdipus Judaicus* thinks, that the lunar crescent might sometimes be indicated by the word *Gibeon*, "though it might more commonly mean the great concave, the cope of heaven." He had prefaced this by saying, that "it means any thing that is either *convex*, or *concave*, or perhaps better, any thing *gibbous*." You observe on this, that "the derivation of Gibeon, as a proper name of a place, happens to be more obvious than that of proper names in general. The Hebrew root *גב* denotes convexity; hence a

“ hill, and a town placed on a hill, was called “ Gibeon.” But you are guilty of a gross error, in limiting the primitive sense of גבע to “ convexity.” This word also denotes any thing hollow, or concave—hence כבוע *caps*, or *mitres*, (Exodus, xxix, 9.) — גביע, *a cup*, (Genesis, xlv, 2.) גבעון is the word גבע with the intensitive ; and consequently signifies either *a great convexity* or *a great concavity*. It is not denied, that גבע or rather גבעה signifies *a hill*, but this is in a secondary sense, as being convex. — Neither is it denied, that there was a town called Gibeon, which stood upon a hill. But the author of the *Œdipus Judaicus* is still correct in saying that Gibeon strictly means either a great convexity, or a great concavity ; and if, as he supposes, the words of Joshua were figurative and allegorical, “ Gibeon” may be rendered “ the cope of heaven,” since it may be faithfully translated “ the great concave.” The

words of Joshua are — שמש נבועק דום literally  
 “ Sun stand still in Gibeon;” or, as some  
 think, “ Sun be silent in Gibeon.” Our trans-  
 lators render the preposition ב “ upon,” —  
 “ Sun, stand thou still *upon* Gibeon.” The  
 LXX render the preposition by “ *κατά*” —  
 Jerome translates it by “ *contra*,” but *in* is the  
 most common and obvious sense, and would  
 have been so rendered, it may be presumed, if  
 the translators had not taken the literal meaning,  
 and it would be rather too absurd to suppose,  
 that Joshua desired the Sun to take up his  
 abode for a day *in* the village called Gibeon.  
 But take the figurative explanation given by the  
 author of the *Œdipus Judaicus*, and the prepo-  
 sition may retain its common meaning — “ Sun,  
 “ stand thou still in the cope of heaven.” (V.)

2. “ I have stated, that *Ajalon* signifies  
 “ a ram. Mr. D'Oyley says that this is directly

“ contrary to fact, and that he can meet with no  
 “ instance whatever of its bearing that meaning.  
 “ I should wish to ask this gentleman, whether  
 “ אֵל be not translated *a ram*, (Gen. xxii, 13.)  
 “ and whether אֵלֶּךָ be any thing else than אֵל  
 “ with an intensive?” (W. D.)—Sir W. treats  
 you too gently. If אֵלֶּךָ bear a meaning at all,  
 it may mean *a ram*, or rather, *a great ram*;  
 because it must be אֵל with the intensive נ; and  
 אֵל has four significations, — 1. *potestas*,  
*fertitudo*, *virtus* — 2. *postis*, *linen* — 3. *cereus* —  
 4. *aries*. How, then, could you presume to say,  
 that it is contrary to fact, that *Ajalon* signifies *a*  
*ram*? It is too ridiculous to find you gravely  
 stating that you can meet with no instance of  
 this. A question arises about the meaning of a  
 proper name. Sir W. D. assigns a meaning to  
 it, according to the strictest etymology; and  
 then you tell us, that you can nowhere find an  
 instance of its bearing this meaning! Why,

Sir, the word אֵילֶן occurs nowhere in the Bible with this orthography, where it is not considered as a proper name, and where it is not rendered, not according to its meaning, but letter for letter, *Ajalon*, or, as it should perhaps be written, *Ailon*. What then can you mean by telling us, that you can find no instance of its signifying a *ram*? The question relates to the original signification of the name, and to the etymology of the word. אֵילֶן is אֵיל with an intensitive; and one of the four meanings of אֵיל is *aries*. The author of the *Onomasticon* has referred אֵילֶן to אֵיל *cervus*, and thinks that *Ajalon* meant *locus cervorum*. What would he have said to a critic, who had told him, “ I cannot find אֵילֶן *cervus*, “ in the *Lexicon*?” — The author of the *Ædipus Judaicus* appears to have thought that Joshua alluded to the constellation of *Aries*. (V.)

3. “ This gentleman (Mr. D'Oyley) asserts,



“ that there happens to be no such word as  
 “  $\pi\gamma$  or  $\pi$  signifying *time* in the Hebrew lan-  
 “ guage. There is indeed,” says he, “ at Exod.  
 “ xxi, 10, the word  $\pi\gamma\tau$ , translated by Buxtorf,  
 “ *tempus determinatum*, with a particular allu-  
 “ sion, and by the LXX  $\text{ὀμιλᾶν}$  ; and there is  
 “ such a word as  $\pi\gamma\tau$  (Ezra, iv, 10.) Chaldee  
 “ for *time*, derived from the Hebrew  $\pi\gamma$ , the  $\tau$   
 “ being inserted, but the  $\pi$  is radical, and can-  
 “ not therefore be dropped. Hence probably  
 “ arose the blunder ; but this will sufficiently  
 “ explain why a person, who can just read the  
 “ Hebrew character, and rapidly turn over the  
 “ leaves of a Lexicon, might easily hit upon an  
 “ ingenious derivation, which has escaped the  
 “ notice of the most profound Hebrew scho-  
 “ lars.” —I quote another remark of the above  
 mentioned Hebraist in his letter to Sir W. D.  
 “ Really this semblance of learning put on by  
 “ Mr. D'Oyley — this assumption by a man,

“ who cannot himself read a single verse of the  
 “ Hebrew Bible without blundering, is quite  
 “ intolerable. If the word עָן do not compre-  
 “ hend *time*, what does this gentleman think of  
 “ Lev. xix, 26, לֹא תַעֲנֶנּוּ, *nor observe times*—  
 “ 2 Kings, xxi, 6, רָעִנָּה, *and observed times*—  
 “ 2 Chron. xxxiii, 6, רָעִנָּה, *also observed times*—  
 “ Deut. xviii, 10, מַעֲנֵן, *an observer of times?*”

But, Sir, I shall not allow you to escape quite  
 so easily. Your consummate ignorance deserves  
 to be fully exposed, since it is accompanied by  
 unexampled arrogance. *First*, Buxtorf, p. 538,  
 refers the word which you cite from Exodus to  
 עָן, which he renders *tempus determinatum*. You,  
 therefore, flatly contradict Buxtorf. *Secondly*,  
 Dr. Taylor, in his Concordance, affixes two sig-  
 nifications to עָן, *viz. habitatio* and *tempus*; and  
 he likewise refers the word at Exodus xxi, 10,  
 to the same radical. You consequently also

oppose his authority. *Thirdly*, it is to be observed that עֲנֻתָּהּ, at Exodus xxi, 10, which is rendered "her duty of marriage" by our translators, properly signifies "her time of cohabitation." *Fourthly*, you say that "there is a word עֲנֻתָּהּ at Exodus xxi, 10, translated by "Buxtorf *tempus determinatum*." No such thing, Sir; Buxtorf has made no such blunder. He translates עֵן, *tempus determinatum*, if you please; but he knew better than to mistake the affix ה for a part of the word, and he accordingly renders עֲנֻתָּהּ *tempus (determinatum) ejus*. His words are עֵן—עֲנֻתָּהּ *f. Tempus juxta Hebræos communiter, sed determinatum, et statutum certæ rei: Aff. עֲנֻתָּהּ, Tempus ejus, Exodus, xxi, 10, &c.* Now really for a man, who cannot even recognise an affix when he meets with it, to take the tone which you have done with the author of the *Œdipus Judaicus*, is unbearable. *Fifthly*, you say, that "there is

“ such a word as עַתָּה, Ezra, iv, 10, Chaldee for  
 “ *time*, derived from the Hebrew עַתָּה, the ך being  
 “ inserted ; but in this,” you continue, “ the ך  
 “ is radical, and cannot be dropped.” Now  
 what does Buxtorf say? — עַתָּה, *Chald.* ‘ *tempus.*  
 כַּעֲתָה, *justa tempus.* Ezra, iv, 10. *id est, tali die,*  
*mense, anno, ut literis præfigi solebat ; contracte*  
 כַּעֲתָה, vers. 17. *Quidam ad עַתָּה referunt, ut ך sit*  
*epentheticum. Multi volunt esse proprium nomen*  
*loci, &c.* 569. Who, Sir, but yourself, would  
 have ventured, upon this evidence, to have pro-  
 nounced decidedly, that the Chaldaic עַתָּה is  
 derived from the Hebrew עַתָּה, and that the ך is  
 inserted? *Quidam ad עַתָּה referunt, &c.* ; and  
 this suffices for you to decide the matter ! Let  
 your readers judge from this specimen, how  
 safely they may trust either to your knowledge,  
 or your judgment. *Sixthly*, we learn from Bux-  
 torf, that *many* are of opinion, that כַּעֲתָה, Ezra)  
 iv, 10, is a proper name. If they be right כַּעֲתָה

at v. 17, must have been written by contraction for the proper name כַּעֲנַת. But, Sir, if these *wany* be right, which I am inclined to think they are, what becomes of you, with your "word עַתָּה " Chaldee for *time*, derived from the Hebrew עַתָּה, the ה being inserted?" *Seventhly*, should it however be true, that כַּעֲנַת, at Ezra, iv, 10, is properly rendered "and at such a time," I have yet to ask you, how you could hazard so much as to say, that there happens to be no such word as עַתָּה signifying "time" in the Hebrew language? If עַתָּה, Sir, had never signified "time," nor comprehended "time" in any of its senses, how came such a scholar as Buxtorf to translate it "*tempus determinatum*," and to refer to it עַתָּה, "Hertime," at Exodus, xxi, 10? Then whence comes the word עַתָּה? It is evident, from the examples given by Mr. JOHN BELLAMY, in his *Criticisms* in the *Classical Journal*, that the English translators derived it from עַתָּה, as a radical significative of "time." R. Salomon,

almost as learned in Hebrew as you are, refers  $\text{זמן}$  to  $\text{זמן}$ , which he does not scruple to translate "time." *R. Salemoni* (says Stockius) *placet notatio hæc, ut ducatur ab זמן, 'tempus.'* And then you, Sir, come forwards, and insult the author of the *Œdipus Judaicus*, for saying that  $\text{זמן}$  signified "time!" (V.)

4. The next word, upon which you exercise your critical talent, is the word "Hittite." Sir W. D. thinks that the Hittites were so called from being worshippers of fire; and he derives  $\text{חית}$  from  $\text{חור}$ , referring to Parkhurst, &c. After the specimens which I have just given of your gross ignorance of the very elements of the Hebrew language, it is amusing to hear your commentary. "I have," say you, "to inform him (Sir W. D.) that the best Hebrew authorities give this root ( $\text{חור}$ ) the sense of 'taking' or 'carrying away,' and that it has no relation

“ in its primary sense to *fire*.” Here is an oracle, indeed! Mr. J. B., however, in his *Criticisms*, tells me another story. “ The *עַרְוִי*, “ *Hittites*, are understood to mean the worshippers of fire, as all the inhabitants of Canaan certainly were, in one shape or another, when the Hebrews departed from Egypt. The word *עַרְוִי* is never used in its remotest branch but with a reference to *fire*.” That he is perfectly correct will appear evident to any person, who will take the trouble of looking for the word *עַרְוִי* in Taylor’s *Concordance*. See Prov. xxv, 22; Isaiah, xxx, 14, &c. &c. The only exception, which can be suggested, is at Psalm, lii, 5. — *עַרְוִי* is there rendered in our version, “ he shall take thee away.” But this is certainly wrong; and accordingly Taylor, 660, 10, properly refers it to *עַרְוִי*, and not to *עַרְוִי*. The translation, therefore, should be, “ he shall break (or bruise) thee.” With all this, how-

ever, you boldly tell us, that the root **חמה** has no relation in its primary sense to *fire*, and that you have the best Hebrew authorities for saying so. You refer to Simonis, Buxtorf, Gussetius, and Guarinus. Out of these authorities I can only at present refer to Buxtorf; and, if you have no more authority from the others, than you have from him, then, your appeal to them is the most impudent that ignorance ever made. Buxtorf in his Chaldaic Lexicon, where he has to mention so many words corrupted and deflected from their original sense, writes as follows — **חמה**, *accipere, capere, propriè ignem è foco; etsi deinde latius usurpetur.* (p. 845.) Buxtorf, then, is one of the best authorities to prove, that **חמה** in its primary sense has no relation to *fire*! I cannot believe, that the other writers, whom you mention, lend more aid to you than Buxtorf. That your reference to him



has helped you, no man will now think ; and after such an example of your total ignorance both of Hebrew learning, and of the opinion of one most profound Hebrew scholar, we may be allowed to doubt, whether Gussetius, or Guarinus, have supported you in an error, which would be disgraceful to them as Hebraists. I repeat with Mr. J. B., that the root in question is never used, in its remotest branch, without reference to *fire*. (V.)

5. Your remarks on the explanation which is given in the *Œdipus Judaicus* of the name of the "Hivites," is utterly contemptible. No scholar would have disgraced himself by writing them. I shall only stop to observe, that if any person besides yourself should be ignorant, that the Serpent was adored by the "Hivites," or "Ophites," I would recommend them to

consult Bryant's learned and ingenious treatise on the "*Ophiolatry*" and the "*OPHION*," lately published by Mr. John Bellamy. (V.)

6. The author of the *Œdipus Judaicus* says, that he strongly suspects, that the name "Perizites" may be Egyptian. He thinks, that by the seven nations doomed to extirpation, were meant the idolators, who adored the seven planets, but who all worshipped chiefly the solar light. He is unwilling to believe, that the just and merciful God of nature commanded the Israelites, contrary to every principle of justice, to butcher the innocent and peaceable inhabitants of Canaan, and then to take possession of their property. That these poor people were idolators was no fault of theirs, however it might have been of their progenitors many hundred years before. Anxious, therefore, to show, that the extirpation was allegorical; that

it indicated the destruction of the seven nations, not as men, but as idolators ; and that it related to the extermination of the false and profane systems of worship practised by the Canaanites, &c. ; the author of the *Œdipus Judaicus* endeavours to prove, that by these Canaanites, Hittites, Hivites, &c. were only meant certain idolatrous sects, which, as sects, should be finally destroyed by the prevalence of the true religion in the land of Palestine, or, if you choose, the Holy Land. This scheme has, I am told, moved Mr. D'Oy-ley's choler, and turned his bile to the colour of ink, for which, as a good Christian, I am heartily sorry. Many other worthy people, I am assured, are likewise grievously offended at the author for talking of allegories, when they can see no good reason, why a running stream should not heap up its waters in a pile\*, in order to

\* It would make a curious subject for calculation, to reckon to what height the waters of the Jordan must have

allow the Israelites to pass dry-footed, and why seven peaceable nations should not be extirpated, men, women, and children, by the command of the Deity, to make room for the amiable people, who, according to the Vulgate, sprung from the thigh of Jacob. (Exod. i.)

That the Canaanites, Hivites, Hittites, Amorites, and Jebusites, denoted certain sects of Tsabaists, I think, the author has rendered highly probable; though the matter has not yet undergone a proper examination from any Hebrew critic. But with respect to the Girgashites, and the Perizites, it may be acknowledged by the author, that he does not consider himself as equally successful. He avowed, indeed, in his book, that he could not trace the origin of the name of the "Girgashites;" and,

been piled up during the time, that the immense army of the Israelites was passing across the dry channel. V.

it might be evident, I think, to any critic who wished to be commonly candid, that he affected nothing like dogmatism, but rather spoke in the language of doubt and uncertainty, when he mentioned the name of the "Perizites, פרזיט," "I strongly suspect," says he, "this proper name to be Egyptian." He goes on to say, that פרז *riz*. in languages which he conceives to be cognate, meant *mystery*, or *cabbala*. I may add that in Chaldaic, it was a common phrase, to say, such and such persons were acting ברז *be-riz*, in mystery, or in secret. *Rizael*, or *Rasael*, was the name of an angel, according to tradition, and the signification of the name of this angel, (who, the traditions say taught the *cabbala* to Adam,) was the *cabbala of God*. According to Kircher, and the Rabbies to whom he refers, the Patriarchs instructed the Egyptians in the *Cabbala*. The word פרז *riz*, then, could scarcely have been unknown to the

Egyptians. The *Cabbalists* themselves were probably denoted *rizin*, or *rizi*; but the Egyptians would prefix their article, and denominate them *Perizi*; and the Egyptian denomination, being given by a people in so many respects superior to the Hebrews, the name might have been retained (*Perizi*) when the word was written. The word *Peor* is an example of the same kind. But it may also have happened, that when the Hebrews exercised themselves with the Egyptians בריזי *berizi*, in the *cabbala*, or *mysteries*, that the latter substituted the *p* for the *b*, and changed the preposition into their own article; and thus those instructed, *berizi*, in the mysteries, were called *Perizi* by the Egyptians; and finally this name prevailed. Such is the view of the subject which the author had in his mind; and being unwilling to imagine, that a whole race of unhappy *villagers* had been extirpated for not worshipping the true God, of

whom they could know nothing, he supposed that the more modern Rabbies, who rendered the *Perisi*, or *Perizites*, villagers, were mistaken in their etymology. It is little to the purpose to say, that no such word as *riz*, *cabbala*, is to be found in the Coptic Lexicons. No Coptic scholar expects to find all, or even a great many ancient Egyptian words in the Coptic. Mr. D'Oyley might have spared himself the trouble of looking into the Lexicons. Sir W. D. knew, as well as he does, that this word was not to be found in them; but from the traditions of the Rabbies, and from their languages being cognate, he could not doubt, that the word in question was known to the Chaldeans, the Hebrews, the Phœnicians, Egyptians, &c. (W. D.)

Sir W. might have remarked in the above note, that the whole of your argument on the etymology of the word "Perizites" is borrowed

from similar arguments employed by a writer in the *Classical Journal*; nor have you much merit, in repeating another's reasoning, without making the slightest acknowledgement. (V.)

7. The next name is אַמֹר, "Amorites;" and you say, that this name is patronymic. But as all proper names in Hebrew are significant, what will this make for your cause? If there was really a man called אַמֹר, this name had a meaning, and was of course not given without a reason. Sir W. D. says, that אַמֹר, *amor*, *agnus*, was the name by which the Chaldeans designated the sign of *Aries*; and according to him, if there was a man called *Amor*, and if the *Amorites* were descended from him, this *Amor* and his posterity were so named from the constellation in which they, like the Egyptians in the Thebais, and the worshippers of Ammon, chiefly adored the Sun. But I see no reason to believe



that the name "Amori" was patronymic; and I doubt not, that it was given to a peculiar sect of Tabeana, as adorers of the Sun in the sign of the Ram, or Lamb.

You state the opinion of Simonis, who supposes, that the *Amorites* were so called, because they inhabited a mountainous country; and you gravely tell us, that this writer derives the name "from the root  $\text{עַמ}$ , *elatus*." I hope for his sake, that he has not made this blunder. Look again, Sir, and you will probably find, that Simonis wrote *elatus fuit*; and then if you had known any thing of the matter, you would have observed, that though this root  $\text{עַמ}$  occurs more than a thousand times in the Bible, it is not used above half-a-dozen times, if so often, in the sense, which, you say, Simonis affixes to it. Besides it is probable, that the name  $\text{עַמ}$ , "*Amori*," is taken from the Chaldees rather than from the

Hebrew. In Hebrew, except the word were in regimen, the name would have been always written אַמֹרִים, *Amorim*; but in the Chaldaic this rule is not observed, and nouns in the plural as often terminate in ך as in ך. In spite of the aid which you obtain from Simonis, and which you employ with so much knowledge of the language, I would ask any man but yourself, whether it be not much more probable, that the Amorites, considered as idolators, should be destroyed by the Providence of God as a sect, (that is to say that their worship should be exterminated,) than that a whole race of people should be extirpated, because they were descendants of a man called Amor, or because they dwelt amidst the mountains of Palestine? (V.)

8. For the remarks which you have made on the explanation given by Sir W. D. on the name of יְבוּסִים, "the Jebusites," that gentleman ought

to return you his sincere thanks. Consult, Sir, as the author of the *Judaicus Œdipus* requested his readers to do, Castelli, Jablonski, and Parkhurst, and then blush, if you can, at your own objections, which betray the most contemptible ignorance, not only of Hebrew, but of the plainest principles of philology. You tell us, truly, that according to the etymology proposed by the author of the *Œdipus Judaicus*, “ו is “substituted for the װ, and the ם and the initial ם “are added ;” and you really seem to think, by this sagacious remark, that you have made the proposed etymology ridiculous. Parkhurst’s *Lexicon* is in the hands of every one, and let him be consulted in *voce* װ. But what, Sir, will the Hebrew critics think of you? Was the *Samech* never substituted for the *schin*, by a dialectical variation? Is the *vau* a radical, that its subtraction, or addition, should make װ a different word from װ? Did you never hear of ם *appel-*

lative in proper names? But it is needless to say more to a man, of whose profound ignorance of Hebrew every one capable of judging must be already convinced. (V.)

9. The author of the *Œdipus Judaicus* observes of the words — עשה לך חרבות צרים — at Josh. v. 2, which are rendered in our version, “make thee sharp knives,” that there is some ambiguity in them, and that they may be translated, “constitute to thyself the desolations of the frosts.” By this, I suppose, he meant only to say, that in a book, which contained many allusions to the Calendar, &c. here might be some latent sense concealed under the obvious and external meaning. You go to your old work of combining the allegorical with the literal sense ; but my business now is with you as a Hebraist.

“ It is true,” you are pleased to tell us,  
 “ that, *if the Masoretic points be thrown aside,*  
 “ the word חרבות may signify ‘ desolations.’ ”  
 If, Sir, any Hebrew scholar can read this sentence without smiling at your ignorance, he will be less good-natured than I was, when I came to it. The Lexicon of Stockius happens to be lying before me, and we shall soon see with what wisdom you have uttered this oracle.

חַרֵּב. *siccatus, exciccatus fuit—vastatus, devastatus, desolatus fuit—stupuit obstupuit.—*  
*Generatim designat consumptionem et privationem—*  
*Speciatim proprie indicat consumptionem*  
*et privationem aquarum, &c.*

חַרֵּב, *m. siccus, vastatus, desolatus, f. חַרְבָּה*,  
 —*vastata, &c. plur.*

חַרְבֹּת, *desolatae, &c. (י.) cum (י.) alternante.*

חֲרֵב, *m. siccitas, vastitas, desolatio, &c.*

חֶרֶב, *f. gladius, ρομφαία, μάχαιρα, a consu-  
mendo, et vastando sic dictus. Generatim notat  
rem consumentem, &c.—synecdoche, notat quæli-  
bet arma bellica, &c. Et secundum autorem libri  
Ohel Moäd designat omnem rem, quæ scindit,  
sive ferrum fuerit, sive lapis durus. Unde hoc  
nomine venit, non solum culter—Josh. v. 2. 3. sed  
etiam cælum, malleus, &c.*

חֲרֵבָה, *f. vastatio, vastitas, desolatio, &c.*

Now it appears from this statement, that the word חֲרֵב bears through all its branches reference to *consuming, laying waste, destroying, desolating, &c.*; and that a sword has been so called from its *laying waste, &c.*—From this last sense (*gladius*) חֲרֵבוֹת has been also understood to signify *knives*, at Josh. v. 2. In order

to mark the different senses that had been thus attached to the word, the Masorites, many ages after the Hebrew ceased to be a living language, affixed certain points to it, in order to mark, both in writing and in pronouncing, a difference to the eye and ear, so that חֶרֶב *gladius* should never be mistaken for חֲרֵב *desolatio*;—the first being written with two *segols*; the last with a *tzere*. But to what does all this amount? — Why, that the Masorites understood the word חֶרֶב sometimes to signify *desolation*, &c. and sometimes a *sword*, or a *knife*; but it is disputed by no one, that the word bears these several senses. The Masorites by their punctuation in the passage before us would confine the word to one sense; while the author of the *Œdipus Judaicus* says, that it *may* bear another. The word חֲרֵבוֹת may signify “knives,” but it may also signify “desolations.” He thinks, that the words bear a double sense; and the Masoretic punctuation

only proves, that the Masorites preferred one of those senses to the other. How is this to interfere with the supposition, that the author of the book may have intended to convey one meaning to the learned, and another to the vulgar? (V.)

10. "But what," you add, "must be the reader's surprise, when he hears, that there is not *any authority whatever*, for translating צר (צריכ) '*frosts*.'" — "I affirm, on the authority of every Lexicon, which I have been able to consult, that there occurs not an instance in any Hebrew writing of the word being used in the sense of cold or frost." Were you not referred to Hutchinson and Parkhurst? I have not the former to consult at this moment; but what does Dr. Parkhurst say at צר, 111? "The word is applied to the celestial fluid, or matter of the heavens, and denotes its being bound close together, so *compressed*



“ or *condensed*. Thus the English, *freeze*, “ *frost*, may be derived from the Hebrew פָּצַר, “ *to compress*.” Now may it not have occurred to the author, that Dr. Parkhurst, without going to another root, פָּצַר, might have saved himself some words by translating צָר to *freeze*, and by understanding it to signify the action of cold upon the air? I have always been taught to believe, that the condensation of the air might be produced by cold. If the LXX could translate צָר, חֹשֶׁךְ, in Isaiah, σκότος ἀληθινόν, *hard darkness*,—if צָר mean the condensation of the celestial fluid, I see no reason why it should not imply the cold by which fluids are usually condensed.

11. The next words, with which you say, Sir W. D. “ makes free,” are חֹרֶף מִצְרַיִם, translated “ the reproach of Egypt,” which he suspects may mean “ the winter of condensing colds.”

“ But,” say you, in your usual tone of arrogance, “ I must inform the reader, that the “ word חורפה, though it frequently occurs in “ Scripture, *never* signifies ‘ winter.’ ” Mr. J. BELLAMY, in his *Criticisms*, says, חורפה means “ the *winter half* of the year, and stands “ opposed to קץ, which includes the *summer half* year, beginning with Spring. Vide “ Isaiah, xviii. 6; Prov. xx. 4; Gen. viii. 22.” But he seems to have overlooked a most notable remark of yours, which follows, and which, indeed, might well puzzle this able Hebrew critic. “ It is חורף, a masculine noun,” say you, “ not חורפה, feminine, which signifies “ ‘ winter.’ ” Now really, Sir, I cannot believe that a boy, who had been learning Hebrew for a week, would have written this sentence. The root חרף signifies *exprobavit* — *probro affectit* — and, according to some, *hyemare*, (Isaiah, xviii. 6,) the substantive noun חורף, *hyems*, occurs,

with that sense affixed to it by the translators, only four or five times. But חרפה rendered *probrum*, from the primary sense of the verb, recurs more frequently. Now, Sir, you tell us that חרפה *never* signifies "winter." I ask, *can* it never bear this meaning? If you admit, that it *can*, you give up your argument — If you assert, that it *cannot*, then you must show, to satisfy the Hebrew scholar, that there is a *radical* difference between חרפה and חרף. As to your talking of the one being masculine, and the other feminine, nothing but gross ignorance of the language would have led you to deny, that, on this account, they might both signify "winter." The final, and servile ה, indicative of the feminine gender, establishes, and can establish no radical difference whatever.

You say, that מצרים *never* signifies "condensing colds." You had better have said,

it is never so translated. But if צר can signify condensation as applied to a fluid, I have already told you, that it can be easily supposed to imply that which generally occasions fluids to be condensed. Such a profound Hebraist, as you are, has not to be told how מצר may be brought from צר. (V.)

I have now, Sir, followed you through every word, which in the first section of your book you have adduced, as proving Sir W. D. to be utterly ignorant of the Hebrew language. Most assuredly I have never witnessed such a production from the combined efforts of arrogance, ignorance, and malice. Retiring, "blood-boltered," from the blows which you received from me, you have sought, with all the rancour of diabolical revenge, to destroy the reputation of Sir W. Drummond. In a book filled with Hebrew criticism, you selected, at your leisure,

and during the lapse of many months, about a dozen examples of what you conceived to be errors upon the part of the author of an unpublished work ; and you have ventured, in consequence, to accuse him as the most arrogant and ignorant of mankind. How terribly, Sir, will your false and injurious accusations recoil on your own head, when this letter shall appear before the Public! It will then clearly appear from what motives, and with what means, you have thus assailed the reputation of a scholar, whom you envy while you abuse, and whom you fear while you hate.

I am, &c.

*VINDEX.*

June 4, 1813.

## LETTER IV.

SIR,

THE second section of your last work contains your animadversions on Sir W. Drummond's *Dissertation on the 49th chapter of Genesis*. You observe, that this dissertation "first made its appearance published in a periodical work, before it was inserted in his unpublished \* work, the *Œdipus Judaicus*. "We may therefore," you add, "well conceive that he has at least bestowed as much care

\* Here the *Œdipus Judaicus* is admitted by Mr. D'Oyley to be an unpublished work ! The truth escaped him in an unguarded moment.

“ and pains on this, as on any part of his book ;  
 “ and he would probably consent beforehand,  
 “ that the general standard of his learning,  
 “ accuracy, and skill, should be ascertained by  
 “ the specimens here afforded.”

After the examples which I have already  
 given of your ignorance, I can have little to fear  
 for my client from any attack which you can  
 make upon him ; but I cannot avoid taking  
 notice of the insidious malignity, with which the  
 sentence, I have just quoted from you, is  
 drawn up. It must seem perfectly fair and rea-  
 sonable to every person, who has not seen the  
*Œdipus Judaicus*, that an Essay which is found  
 in it, and which had been before published,  
 should be considered as a general standard by  
 which the whole work might justly be judged.  
 But what is the truth ? The *Dissertation on the*  
*49th chapter of Genesis* was published, before

the author conceived the design of writing the *Œdipus Judaicus* ; but as this dissertation was not unconnected with the general subject, it was reprinted in the unpublished work, not indeed from the CLASSICAL JOURNAL, but from the original manuscript which remained in the hands of the printer. By the time the unpublished work was nearly finished, the author saw, that some errors, which after all are of no great importance, had escaped him in the dissertation, which he had communicated to the Editor of the Classical Journal. He accordingly says, at page lxxix, “ It may be necessary for me  
 “ to observe here, that when I wrote my dissertation on the 49th chapter of Genesis, I did  
 “ not perceive so fully as I do at present, the  
 “ truth or importance of the system which I  
 “ have since adopted. I have consequently  
 “ spoken with less attention to some astronomical facts than I should have done, &c.”



Such, Sir, is the statement of the author ; and I should wish to know, how any man, with the slightest pretensions to candour, after perusing this passage, could come forwards, and tell the Public, that, “ we may well conceive  
 “ that the author has bestowed as much care  
 “ and pains on this, as on any part of his book,  
 “ and would probably consent beforehand, that  
 “ the general standard of his learning, accuracy,  
 “ and skill, should be ascertained by the specimens here afforded ? ” To him, who had never seen the *Œdipus Judaicus* — who had never heard of these avowals on the part of the author — it might be perfectly allowable to attack the dissertation, as it appeared in the Classical Journal, with all the severity of the most rigid criticism ; but you have not only endeavoured to do this, (I say *endeavoured*, because you have failed in the attempt), but you have sought to make it appear, that this disser-

tation is precisely the part of his book, by which Sir W. D. would wish to be tried. There is a disingenuousness in this conduct, from which a generous mind would have shrunk. But, Sir, I shall leave others to judge from this example, what are the motives and the principles by which you are guided. I fear not to meet you on the ground which you have chosen. I shall frankly state the errors into which the author has fallen in an Essay, which was written long before he had matured his system ; but I shall have the satisfaction of showing, that these errors have been grossly and malignantly exaggerated by you ; while you yourself, in the midst of all your swaggering and bullying, and with all your arrogant pretensions, for which I am indeed told you are already laughed at in your University, have committed some as absurd blunders as ever disgraced the pen of a sciolist.

Sir W. D. endeavours to show in his dissertation, that the 12 signs of the zodiac were represented on the standards of the 12 tribes of Israel, and he thinks that Jacob alluded to these signs in his dying speech. Why, indeed, the Patriarch should not take his figurative language from the heavens, as well as from the forest, or the wilderness, I pretend not to guess ; but, it seems, the author's hypothesis has drawn upon him the charge of infidelity. As, however, this charge (whether true, or false,) authorises those persons who bring it forwards, to treat the accused with every species of obloquy, and leaves him little chance of obtaining any hearing whatever in his own defence, I am not surprised at its being urged by you against Sir W. D. — I, for my part, am totally unable to see, that his hypothesis must be that of an infidel ; and under these circumstances, I can have no hesitation in defending it before the Public.

You say that there are but two authorities of any weight, on which Sir W. D. founds his hypothesis; and these are Aben Ezra, and Jonathan Ben Uzziel. These authorities, you observe, are "Aben Ezra, a learned Jew of the 12th Christian century, and the author of the Targum of the books of the Law, which is ascribed to Jonathan Ben Uzziel: The æra of the latter author is uncertain; the Targum is a fanciful work not much considered by the learned, by some judged to be of recent date, by none placed higher than the 5th Christian century, and by all held to be of little authority." What a confused, blundering statement is this! The æra of Jonathan Ben Uzziel is not uncertain, if we can trust to the Jewish writers, from whom alone we are likely to obtain any information concerning it. — They assure us, that Jonathan was the disciple of Hillel, and Hillel died

about the time of Christ's birth. You say that the Targum is a fanciful work, not much considered by the learned, and by all held to be of little authority. Of what Targum do you speak? The Targum of Onkelos on the Law, and that of Jonathan on the Prophets, are both highly revered by the learned. You must mean then the Targum on the Law ascribed to Jonathan. But here you are again in an error. P. Burgensis, who wrote in 1429, attests that this Targum on the Law, ascribed to Jonathan, was held among the Jews in almost as high authority as the Text itself. Your assertion, that this Targum is "by *none* placed higher than the "5th century," betrays gross ignorance. Helvicus, Postellus, Galatinus, Phagius, Serarius, ascribe this Targum to Jonathan, who, as we have seen, must have flourished before Christ; and then you tell your readers, that it is by *none* placed higher than the 5th Christian century!

The truth is this. Some learned writers, Buxtorf among others, contend, that this Targum is not Jonathan's — 1st, because the style, manner, and language, differ from what we find in the Targum on the Prophets — 2nd, because mention is made of the six orders of the *Mishnah*, of the proper names, *Lombardy*, *Constantinople*, &c. But to these two arguments it may be replied ; *first*, as the Targum of Onkelos on the Law was that which was publicly read in the synagogues, and that of Jonathan on the Prophets, these two Targums would be preserved as nearly as possible in their original state ; but as the Targum on the Law by Jonathan was not so read, greater liberties may have been taken with it by the transcribers, who may have occasionally altered the diction, and added to the matter. *Secondly*, though Prideaux tells us, that the second argument “ cuts the throat “ of this pretence,” (*viz.* that Jonathan was the

author), yet it may be observed, that with the same weapon this writer would cut the throat of the pretence, by which we hold Moses to be the author of the Pentateuch. Circumstances and proper names are introduced into the Pentateuch, which could not have been known to the sacred historian himself, and which had no existence until after his time; but to this it is answered, that these are interpolations and alterations which were made afterwards. If this happened with respect to the books of the Law, why should it not have happened to the Targum on those books? But be this as it may, I cannot but wonder at the confidence, with which you have so ignorantly asserted, that none have placed this Targum higher than the 5th Christian century. Why, Sir, what have all these done, (Christian writers and Jewish Doctors,) who have ascribed it to Jonathan Ben Uzziel, who was the disciple of Hillel before Christ was born?

With respect to the evidence, which is given in this Targum on the subject in question, you tell your readers, that " Sir W. D. gives it very " incorrectly, and evidently merely picked it " up, as he found it somewhere quoted, without " consulting the original." This is the way, in which you dispose of an author's character ; and because you charge that author with *infidelity*, this kind of conduct is to be applauded. Where, Sir, did you ever see the passage quoted, before you saw it in the *Œdipus Judaicus*? My reading is, perhaps, as extensive as your own ; and I have never seen this passage cited any where. But " Sir W. D. gives the evidence " very incorrectly." We shall soon see whether that charge be true. " He says," you tell us, " that the figure of a man is given to Ephraim, " whereas it is that of a boy in the original." For having said this, I will tell you, that you cannot read the original. In the original the



word is ריבא (Jon. Targ. Num. 2.) In the Latin version you found צורת ריבא, translated *figura pueri*. Now it so happens, that if the reading in the text be right, the version is wrong; for ריבא (Buxt. Chald. Lex. 2185,) does not signify "a boy," but "a girl," and the translation should have been *figura puellæ*. This then is a happy specimen of your critical skill. You accuse Sir W. D. of not consulting the original. You apply to the Latin version; and you adopt the translation there given, which is manifestly wrong, if the reading, as it now stands in the text, be right. But it is not true, that the author of the *Œdipus Judaicus* did not consult the original. He suspected that the translator had read ריבא, *puella*, as if it had been רביא, *puer*; but it occurred to him, that the true reading was ריבא, and I find it so marked on the margin of his Polyglott. The word רביא ought to be strictly rendered *puer*; but ריבא may be

properly translated *juvenis, adolescens*. (Ruth, iii, 10.) If then Sir W. D. be right in reading רִיבָא, "a young man," instead of רִיבָא, "a girl," he is also correct in stating that the figure of a man was given, according to this Targum, to Ephraim. His reason for preferring the reading adopted by him, is this. Aben Ezra says, that the four principal standards in the camp corresponded with the four cherubic heads. How Jonathan and Aben Ezra came to mention, the one, *a basilisk*, and the other, *an eagle*, is explained by Kircher, on the authority of the Rabbis; for the Basilisk, or as we make it, the Scorpion, was exchanged as an emblem, by the tribe of Dan, for the Eagle. But it is impossible to reconcile Jonathan with Aben Ezra, if the present reading (צורת רִיבָא) in the Targum be followed; and Sir W. D. observing the error certainly committed in the Latin version, if this reading be right, did not doubt, that the ṽ had

been wrongly printed for the 1. But how can you, Sir, justify yourself? You lift the rod of correction against another for not consulting the original ; and yet you adopt what must be a blunder on the part of the translator, if the text be not corrupt.

Your next remark is worthy of its predecessor. “ He (Sir W. D.) says again, that a bull is  
 “ given to Reuben ; on the other hand the  
 “ Targum says that this tribe bore the figure  
 “ of a stag ; that it ought to have borne that of  
 “ an ox, but that Moses changed it, in order  
 “ that the memory of the worshipped calf might  
 “ not be recalled.” The Latin version runs more faithfully, thus — *in eo (vexillo) etiam insculpta fuit figura cervi, videbatur quidem in eo insculpenda figura bovis, verum Moses Propheta mutavit ipsam, ne in memoriam revocaretur illis peccatum vituli.* How then is Sir W. D.

incorrect? Does it not appear that, according to this Targum, a bull (a castrated bull if you choose) was the original emblem of the tribe of Reuben, and continued to be so, until Moses changed it to that of a stag? The author was speaking of times previous to the worship of the golden calf; and consequently his business was only to state, on the authority of this Targum, what had been the original emblems of the four principal tribes. So much, Sir, for these two charges of incorrectness which you have brought against Sir W. D. They have only served to prove your own ignorance of the Chaldaic, and the inaccuracy of which you yourself can be guilty while you are unjustly criminating another writer.

You proceed to observe, that “if we consider the dates of these two accounts (those given by Jonathan and Aben Ezra), we shall

“ see the strongest reason for rejecting them as  
 “ destitute of authority.” You then state that  
 the Israelites departed from Egypt 1500 years  
 B. C. — that the Targum bears date certainly  
 not before 500 A. C. (this is not admitted to  
 you), and that Aben Ezra lived 1200 years A. C.  
 You go on to say, that there is thus an interval  
 in the one case of 2000, and in the other of  
 nearly 3000 years ; that as we hear nothing of  
 any traditions among the Jews concerning the  
 standards originally borne by the 12 tribes\* ;  
 and that as Onkelos, the Talmudists, Philo, and  
 Josephus, who convey to us all *authentic* tra-  
 ditions respecting Jewish affairs and history,  
 are totally silent on this subject ; we may safely  
 agree with Witsius and Bochart, in considering  
 the traditions in question, and which are reported

\* This is altogether incorrect, as Mr. D'Oyley would  
 find, if he would, or could, read the writings of the Rabbis.

by Jonathan and Aben Ezra, as mere figments of the later Rabbis. You add, that Witsius and Bochart pay so little regard to the Targum of Jonathan, that they do not even mention its testimony with regard to this subject.

If Bochart and Witsius, men of immense erudition, from whom you have taken every word that deserves any serious notice in this part of your book, had met with the passage, to which reference is made in the *Œdipus Judaicus*, I cannot believe that they would have passed it over unnoticed. You say that these two writers pay so little regard to the Targum of Jonathan, that they do not even mention its testimony. I cannot at this moment consult Witsius ; but I find that Bochart quotes, over and over again, this Targum which is ascribed to Jonathan. He cites it too as Jonathan's. This same Bochart was at the trouble to look into Philo and

Josephus — nay he searched the Talmud, to see if he could meet with any thing to authorise the assertions of Aben Ezra. He even went into a discussion on the subject about the meaning of a verse, in Psalm lxviii, concerning this question. Is it likely then, that if he had happened to read Jonathan's Targum at Numb. ii, he would have failed to have taken notice of it? Every person, however, who has read Bochart's works, (and all must admire his learning, if all do not acknowledge him to have had liberal notions,) must be perfectly aware, that he was maintaining in his attack against Aben Ezra, in this place, an untenable position. Bochart thought that there were no cherubic figures, sculptured in the Temple, such as are described by Ezekiel.

If, however, the Targum on the Books of the Law, ascribed to Jonathan, be his, there

can be little doubt, that upon any traditional subject there is no authority so high. The disciple—the most celebrated disciple of Hillel, could not have been materially wrong upon any subject of tradition, at the commencement of the Christian æra ; unless, indeed, all the most learned Jewish writers are in utter error. But Onkelos has said nothing on the subject. Onkelos has rather given a Chaldaic translation of the Pentateuch, than a paraphrase. Neither have the Talmudists, say you, mentioned any thing of the standards. You are bolder here than Borchart, who seems to say, that this is the case as far as he knows ; but, perhaps, Witsius, to whom I cannot refer, speaks more certainly. I have not the means, just now at least, of consulting the Talmud ; at the same time I should not expect to find any direct allusion to the subject there. With respect to Philo and Josephus, it is true, that they make no direct mention of



what were the ensigns, which distinguished the standards of the tribes of Israel from each other. That these ensigns were different cannot be doubted ; and because the sacred historian himself, Onkelos, the Talmudists, Josephus, and Philo, have not told us what these ensigns were, are we to say that all tradition concerning them must be false ?

You rather startled me by asserting, that the Talmudists, Philo, and Josephus, convey to us *all authentic* traditions concerning Jewish affairs and history. I had been accustomed to suspect these authors of reporting occasionally some very childish tales. But there is nothing like having a clear-headed critic, who can dispel all our doubts by an assertion. I must, however, remind you, that though Philo and Josephus do not mention the standards, they yet make some statements not unfavourable to the supposition,

or the tradition, whichever it be. You will remember, that Aben Ezra states that the emblems, which were displayed on the four principal standards, corresponded with the cherubic figures. Now these have been pretty clearly shown to have been the same with the emblems, which denoted the solstitial and equinoctial signs. What then does Philo insinuate, unless it be, that the cherubim represented the two hemispheres, and consequently that well known Jewish division of the autumnal equinox and winter solstice, opposed to the vernal equinox and the summer solstice. (*Œd. Jud.* p. 127.) His words are—"What if it be taken otherwise?—so that the two cherubim signify both hemispheres." (p. 111 and 112.)

Josephus tells us, that if any one refer the 12 stones, worn by the High Priest, as the symbols of the 12 tribes of Israel, to the 12 signs

of the Zodiac, he will not be much in the wrong. (*Æd. Jud.* p. 141.)

The Chaldaic Paraphrast on the Canticle of Canticles tells us, that these 12 stones were made to resemble the 12 signs of the Zodiac. (*Æd. Jud.* p. 6.)

After having read all these things; and especially in Philo and Josephus, I can see nothing improbable in the statements of Jonathan and Aben Ezra, or in the arguments founded upon them by the author of the *Ædipus Judaicus*. As the 12 stones in the breast-plate represented the 12 signs of the Zodiac, is it not likely, that the 12 ensigns of the tribes likewise represented these signs? But when this hypothesis is supported by the authority of the Targum, ascribed to a Jew, who flourished 18 centuries ago, and who of all others was the most versant in the

traditions of his countrymen ; and when it also receives strong confirmation from that learned Rabbi, Aben Ezra, I think it seems to be established upon highly probable evidence. But this evidence, I fear not to aver it, is greatly corroborated by Sir W. D.'s Essay on the 49th chapter of Genesis.

There are four authors, who, you state, have supported this hypothesis—Kircher—an anonymous French writer—Dupuis—and Drummond. You might have added a fifth, for it has been also adopted by a German writer, though he differs considerably from all the others. But even among the four first there is a difference of opinion concerning the allotment of the signs ; and you argue from this, that the general hypothesis is unfounded. But Kircher, Dupuis, and Drummond, do not differ about the four principal standards ; for as Joseph's standard was after-

wards assigned to Ephraim, there is no real difference among them on that point ; and it is by determining, whether these symbols corresponded with the solstitial and equinoctial signs, that the question is principally to be tried. Now let Philo's remark, as well as that of Clemens Alexandrinus, concerning the cherubic figures, be carried in mind ; and let the explanation given by Kircher be considered, why the Basilisk, or as we have it the Scorpion, was exchanged for the Eagle ; and it will probably appear, that this hypothesis is founded both on reason and on Scripture.

I have now, however, to follow you to other grounds. It is already pretty evident, that, upon subjects of Hebrew and Chaldaic literature, you have entirely failed in your attacks upon Sir W. D. ; and that you have shown withal so much malignity blended with your

ignorance, as to make it impossible for any man of a liberal mind, (however otherwise inclined to support you,) greatly to lament your defeat. You, however, now turn to the subject of astronomy; and abuse the author of the *Œdipus Judaicus* in the most scurrilous terms, which vindictive rage can suggest.

You commence your attack, by directing the attention of your readers to Sir W. D.'s definition of the word *paranatellon*. "By the paranatellon of a sign he means the extra-zodiacal stars, which rise above the horizon, or sink below it, during the time that the sign takes to rise or set." You say, that the author derives this definition from Dupuis; but you add, that you believe it to be *perfectly correct*. You ask, however, in what degree the author adheres to his explanation, or even understands what it means. You then proceed to examine

his 18th plate ; and because he has there represented *Cepheus*, *Pegasus*, and *Equiculus*, as paranatellons of *Leo*, you accuse him of utter ignorance of the first elements of astronomy, and insult him with even more than your usual grossness and vulgarity.

Let it be supposed, that the definition is perfectly correct, and that you have understood the author exactly as he meant to be understood. It will then follow, that *Cepheus*, *Pegasus*, &c. cannot be paranatellons of *Leo*, since by paranatellons are meant extra-zodiacal stars, which either rise with a sign, or set with a sign ; and (at 30° N. L.) the constellations above mentioned ascend in the east, while *Leo* descends in the west. In this case, the author might justly be charged with inaccuracy. It would be obvious, that he had used a word in an improper sense, and in another way than his own expla-

nation of it warranted, and thus far, undoubtedly, he would deserve reprehension. I must tell you, however, that rigidly to bind down an author, who treats only incidentally of scientific subjects, throughout his whole work, to the exact explanation, which he may have given in any part of it, is a harder rule than many writers, even of the first rank, could bear. In books which professedly treat of the sciences, and where a continued chain of proof is to be carried on, it is highly important, that no word should ever be employed in a larger sense than its first definition authorises. Even in a mixed work, any departure from the author's explanation of a word is a blemish, and merits censure. But who, Sir, but yourself, on perceiving, or imagining, an incongruity between the definition of a word, and the use sometimes made of it, in a work not professedly scientific, would in consequence of this incongruity charge the



author with the most stupid ignorance which can be conceived to disgrace the human intellect? Mr. Locke has defined the word "idea," which recurs in every page of his Essay, in such a manner, that if his definition be accurate, it is impossible that the mind could be perceptible of external objects. Nevertheless Mr. Locke did not doubt of the existence of external objects; and, as Dr. Reid believes, would have admitted that we can think of numberless things which are not ideas in the mind. It is, indeed, obvious, that Mr. Locke, notwithstanding his definition, uses the word "idea" in the vulgar as well as in the philosophical sense. That this writer deserves blame for having first limited the word to one sense, and for then having occasionally used it in another, will not be denied; but who could bear it, if any man were to venture to say, "Locke's definition of the word 'idea' is correct; but when he talks of the existence of

“ external things, as being perceptible to the  
 “ mind, he contradicts himself, and shows him-  
 “ self to have been grossly ignorant, and utterly  
 “ incapable of writing upon metaphysical sub-  
 “ jects ?” The author of the *Œdipus Judaicus*  
 has called *Cepheus* a paranatellon of *Leo*. This  
 either is, or seems to you, incongruous with his  
 definition. Most adversaries, I believe, would  
 have been satisfied with accusing the writer of  
 inaccuracy, and inconsistency ; but you had  
 raised the cry of infidelity against him, and  
 with this advantage on your side you were  
 resolved to carry your insults as far as possible,  
 and far beyond all bounds of moderation and  
 justice. It is true, that Dupuis had represented  
*Cepheus* in some of his plates as the paranatellon  
 of *Leo* ; but though you endeavour to tarnish his  
 reputation as an astronomer, your language con-  
 cerning him is mild, when compared with that  
 which you hold of Sir W. D. The Christian

Advocate knows, that Dupuis has denied the truth of the Christian revelation, and that this has not been done by the author of the *Œdipus Judaicus*, — but there may be reasons, why the avowed is more gently treated than the suspected infidel. — Mr. D'Oyley believes, that the letters of Vindex are written by Sir W. D. Let me tell you, however, that your charges of ignorance against this writer are dictated by such a spirit of malice, and are carried to such an extravagant excess, as to make it impossible for any impartial reader to listen to them. You have the impudence to assert, that “such is Sir W. D.’s radical ignorance of his subject, that he evidently supposes, that those constellations which have the same latitude with *Leo*, and those which differ in longitude by  $180^{\circ}$ , rise and set at the same time with *Leo*.” This absurd assertion will be believed by none but by the most ignorant and prejudiced of the

author's enemies. No man of common candour, or of common sense, will conclude, that because Dupuis and Drummond may not have adhered to the explanation, which they have given of the word "paranatellon," they did not know east from west, and fancied that two constellations were rising together, while one of them was setting before their eyes. The extravagance of your charge is an antidote to the poison which it was intended to convey.

But I have been hitherto treating the subject, as if the definition were correct, and as if you had understood the author as he meant to be understood. Now it so happens, that this definition, which you believe to be perfectly correct, is deficient and obscure. It is deficient, because the word "paranatellon" may be used in a larger sense than is here implied; and it is obscure, because it *may* be understood in the

sense which you have given it, and which certainly was not that which the author meant to convey. So far an objection might be justly made to the definition by those who understand the subject. But, Sir, what can you say for yourself in pronouncing this definition to be perfectly correct? In the way in which you have chosen to understand it, it is, as I shall presently show, absolutely false, erroneous, and incorrect in the greatest degree. It really then becomes you to bully and bluster, and to talk of the gross ignorance of Dupuis and Drummond, when you cannot stir a step yourself without falling into a blunder.

The paranatellon of a sign may be defined as follows.

An extra-zodiacal constellation may be denominated the paranatellon of a sign under four different circumstances.

1. Any constellation rising from the horizon beside a sign may be denominated its paranatellon. Thus e. g., when *Cancer* rises at Naples, *Canis Minor* is a paranatellon of this sign.

2. A constellation, which rises with a sign to the meridian, may be called its paranatellon. Thus at London when *Canis Major* approaches the meridian it becomes a paranatellon of *Gemini*; and *Auriga* and *Orion* are in the same sense paranatellons of *Taurus*. The achronycal risings of these constellations are nevertheless very different from those of the signs with which they rise to the meridian.

3. But the preposition *παρὰ* signifies *contra* as well as *juxta*; and the word *παρὰντέλλον* may be properly employed to denote, not only a constellation rising *beside* and *with* a sign, but a

constellation rising *opposite* to a sign, and consequently when the sign is setting.

4. A constellation may be called the parantellon of a sign, while the constellation on the opposite side of the heavens to the sign, continues rising towards the meridian.

Now, Sir, how has it happened, that you should not know, that the Greek preposition *παρὰ* signifies *contra* as well as *juxta*; and that *παρὰντέλλειν* (whence *παρὰντέλλον*) signifies "to rise against, or contrary to," as well as "to rise beside?"

When the author said, that by the parantellons of a sign he meant the extra-zodiacal stars which rise or set, while the sign rises or sets, I understood him to intend to say, (and I know

he did intend to say) that those stars are parantellons of a sign, which rise when the sign rises, and when the sign sets — that is — all stars, out of the zodiac, are parantellons of a sign, which rise either beside and with it, or, directly over-against it. You evidently understand the author to mean, that any constellations, or extra-zodiacal stars, are parantellons of a sign, which either rise at the same time with the sign, or set at the same time with the sign. Thus you understand the definition to say, that extra-zodiacal stars setting at the same hour with a sign, are necessarily its parantellons, — that is, — they rise at the same hour with the sign, because they have set with it. Under these circumstances, and so understanding the definition, you, who would pass yourself off for an astronomer, and who grossly and injuriously insult Dupuis and Drummond, pronounce this definition to be perfectly correct. Now, Sir, it



happens, for your honour as a man of science, that this definition as you have understood it, though not as the author meant it, is so far from being perfectly correct, that taken, as you have taken it, it would be absolutely false and erroneous. A constellation which sets with a sign may not rise with it. At Damascus, for example, *Arcturus* sets at the same time with *Antares*. They never rise there together. It becomes, you, truly, to talk of ignorance! You have admitted as perfectly correct a definition, which, according to your interpretation of it, asserts that stars setting with a sign, are necessarily its paranatellons, or rise beside and with it. This is such a blunder, as marks pretty well your degree of astronomical skill. No, Sir. The author's definition is obscure; but it might have been obvious even to you, from the use which he has made of the word, that he meant by the paranatellons of a sign, such stars and

constellations, as rise beside the sign when it rises, or opposite to the sign when it sets. The word bears either meaning; and might have been understood in either sense as the circumstances, under which it was employed, required.

Your attempt to play the part of a man of science is, indeed, lamentable; but as it is your first appearance in this character, I should have been inclined to treat you with indulgence, if your vanity had not been seconded by your malevolence, in inducing you to undertake it. A man of science! Do you really believe, that you will be mistaken for one? No, Sir. Your pedantic language will not deceive the critics. They will only smile at your affectation, when they see you giving definitions instead of employing common terms. A man of science, who was not writing an elementary book, and who had to mention "a planisphere," would have

named it at once, nor have doubted that he was understood by all who were competent to follow his reasoning. You, however, cannot condescend to employ so vulgar a word ; and it is pleasant to hear you talking from some dictionary “ of the “ sphere projected on the plane of the ecliptic !” But I shall treat of your pretensions to astronomical knowledge, of which I have given a slight specimen already, in a future Letter ; and I engage to prove that these pretensions of yours are combined with more arrogance and ignorance, than probably ever came together before. You affect to call Sir W. D., in derision, “ a “ *learned* author.” Forgive me, Sir, if I cannot return you the compliment, even in jest.

I am, &c.

**VINDEX.**

June 12th, 1813.

## LETTER V.

SIR,

BEFORE I take any further notice of your skill as an astronomer, I must make a few remarks on the words *Hyk* and *Shuleh*, which occur in Sir W. D.'s Essay, and concerning which you are pleased to speak, as usual, in a very decided tone, and with a very profound ignorance of the matter in question.

Sir W. D. thinks that the word *ppro*, sometimes translated "a Lawgiver," and sometimes "a Governor," in our version, was related to the old Ethiopian word *hyk*, "a king." Your

M

comment is as follows. "I wish," say you, "to remark, that our author has *not the slightest authority*, for translating the Hebrew word  $\text{קִינִי}$ , 'a king,' or for considering it as allied to his old Ethiopian word *kyk*. The Hebrew word  $\text{קִינִי}$  does not signify 'power,' or 'superiority,' which would lead to the sense of 'a king.' Its primary meaning is 'to engrave, prescribe, decree;' —  $\text{קִינִי}$  and  $\text{קִינִי}$  signify 'statutes, laws, decrees;' and hence the participle  $\text{קִינִי}$ , used substantively. 'one who decrees, one who makes laws, a lawgiver.' Such is your comment: I will now trouble you with mine.

The word *kyk*, as we learn from Manetho, signified "a king" in the sacred dialect of Egypt. We learn the same thing from Eusebius. Now the people, who established themselves in Egypt, and who were called *Hyt-sois*, that is,

*King-shepherds*, were certainly either Arabians, or Ethiopians. Manetho says, that they were Arabians; but this is of no consequence, since the sacred language of Ethiopia was Hamyarite Arabic. The word *kyk* "a king" belonged therefore to the ancient Ethiopian and Arabic. In the Geez, or sacred language of Ethiopia, in which a considerable portion of the ancient tongue is probably preserved, and which bears a close affinity to the Hamyarite dialect, *kyk* signifies "law," *kykyk* to "legislate." In Arabic, *حق* signifies "right, a decree, a statute," &c.; and God, as the dispenser of justice, is denominated *حق*. In Hebrew, *pr* signifies "a statute, a decree," &c. — *ppr* is rendered "a lawgiver," &c, in our translation. But both these words are referred to *ppr*, of which, you tell us, one of the *primary* senses is "to decree;" though you also tell us, with a logic all your own, that it does not signify

“power,” or “superiority,” which would lead to the sense of “a king.” If, however, “to decree” be a *primary* sense of the word, it implies both “power” and “superiority” which might lead to the sense of “a king.” קר and קרמו may be brought with equal regularity from קר, of which a *primary* meaning is “to decree.” The former, קר, is a radical noun, which throws away the second doubled radical — The latter, קרמו, is a heemantive noun, or, if you please, a participle used substantively. Now I do not hesitate to believe, with the author of the *Ædipus Judaicus*, that in all the above mentioned dialects, the words, which I have noted, were related. But you triumphantly tell your readers, that Sir W. D. *has not the slightest authority* for translating the Hebrew word קרמו “a king.” What will be thought of Mr. D'Oyley's authority, when it is known, that at Psalm lx, and Psalm cviii, this very word is rendered

Βασιλεὺς by the LXX? Nor is this all—it is rendered by words equivalent to “a king” in the Ethiopian, Arabian, and Syriac versions!

You are next pleased to tell us, that you can find no authority for *Shuleh*,—that Sir W. Jones, Dupuis, and Hyde, give the name of this asterism, *Shaulah*, *Shaula*, and *al Shaula*;—and that Drummond *entirely on his own authority* CONVERTS the name into *Shuleh*. Here is a display of erudition! Hyde and Sir W. Jones (for Dupuis knew no more of Arabic than you do) wrote, or read, the word شَوْلَه, with its characteristic marks, and of course, in denoting the presence of the *phatha*, put it into Roman characters *Shaulah*, or, as Hyde less properly has it, *Shaula*. Sir W. D. leaves out the characteristic marks, as is frequently done in ordinary writing, and gives the word as it stands in its original form, شوله, *Shuleh*, or *Shulah*;



and then you tell your readers, that he has converted شَوْلَه into شَوْلَه, entirely upon his own authority, as if he had actually changed one word into another. Will the Arabic scholar believe it possible, that a man pretending to know the language should talk in such a style? The characteristic marks, *phatha*, *damma*, and *kesra*, were invented by Abauli Ebn Mocla, I believe, about the middle of the fourth century of the *Hegira*, and consequently when the language was upon its decline. These marks are employed to denote the vowels which are to be supplied in pronouncing a word; but their insertion, or omission, can in no way radically affect the word. Indeed, they are so variously affixed to words by the Arabs themselves, that the use of them is generally hazardous to European strangers. How can it be otherwise when the learned Asiatics cannot agree upon the subject? Mr. Richardson mentions, that, among many

examples, the word مائة, *a hundred*, is so variously pointed as to sound *maït*, *miet*, *mayat*, *maïst*, *maïsten*, &c. Among Europeans Arabic words are continually supplied with different vowels. For the Arabs of *Humyar*, some have written *Homar*, and Sir W. Jones writes *Himyar*, &c. In all events it is certain, that these characteristic marks were not employed until the time of *Abauli*; and it would be vain to contend, from their presence, that a word was always pronounced with the same vowels in Arabic as it is at present. The *matres lectionis*, where they occur, seem to have been the guides of the ancients; but no man who knows any thing of the language would say, that Drummond had converted شَوْل into another word by writing it شوله. You are, however, even wrong in asserting that he wrote the word *Schuleh* entirely upon his own authority. Kitcher (*Ced. Æg.* 11.) wrote it *Schuleh*, more than a

hundred years before Sir W. D. existed. Thus, Sir, do you go on blundering at every step ; but quite unconscious, I believe, that you are doing so, and vain of the gaudy display of your literary tinsel.

You proceed to observe " that there is no  
 " part of Sir W. D.'s assumptions more tho-  
 " roughly demonstrative of his ignorance (if he  
 " really be in earnest) than his pretending, that  
 " the Patriarch Jacob (1700 years B. C.)  
 " alluded to the *modern* Arabic names of the  
 " stars. The Arabians," you continue, " we  
 " have every reason to believe from history, did  
 " not apply scientifically to astronomy, till the  
 " time of the Caliphs about A. D. 800. Near  
 " that time, Almahon caused the *Almagestum*  
 " of Ptolemy to be translated into Arabic ; and  
 " some years afterwards, Albategnius published  
 " improvements on these tables. It is from

“ these astronomers that we have derived the  
 “ Arabic names of stars in our Greek constella-  
 “ tions. Thus our author *only* anticipates the  
 “ names by about 2500 years. (See Lalande’s  
 “ Astron. L. 2, p. 121.) ”

Whether you, Sir, be in earnest, or not, I  
 neither know, nor care ; but I am very certain  
 of this, that you have very thoroughly demon-  
 strated your own ignorance in the words which  
 I have just cited from you. You refer truly to  
 Lalande. Where has he told you that the  
 Arabic names of the stars are *modern*? Where  
 has he informed you, that these names are not  
 more ancient than A. D. 800 ? You may have  
 learned from him, that Almamon revived the  
 science of astronomy in Arabia, and that it  
 never flourished in that country before, (and  
 especially for some centuries before,) as it did  
 in the reign of that Caliph ; but where has

Lalande told you, that astronomy had not been cultivated at all, — that the zodiac had not been divided by the Arabians, — and that the stars had not been named by them from the most remote antiquity? I defy you to commit in such a degree the respectable authority of Lalande; and without you can do so, the assertions hazarded by your own intrepid ignorance are of no avail whatever.

There is no doubt among those, who know any thing of the subject, that the Arabians had cultivated the study of astronomy, however imperfectly in comparison with the Indians, the Chaldeans, the Egyptians, and even with those children in science the Greeks, from a very remote period. Alhargani, who flourished about A. D. 800, the very era to which you refer, states that his countrymen had divided the zodiac into 28 parts from the most remote antiquity. This

testimony is admitted even by M. Montucla, who was not much inclined to favour such pretensions. You had evidently no idea at all about the matter; and talked from Lalande, who gives from Montucla the modern history of Arabian astronemical science. But neither Montucla nor Lalande would have authorised you to speak of the Arabians, as a people, who had not even named the constellations until the 8th or 9th Christian century. The authority of M. Bailli is *almost* as weighty as yours. He remarks that the names of the 28 divisions refer to the names given to the 12 divisions of the zodiac; but he adds, “ nous ne croyons pas qu’on puisse en conclure que ces signes aient reçu ces noms *du bétier*, &c. des Grecs d’Alexandrie; parceque tous les témoignages réunis ici déposent que ces noms sont originaires d’Asie, et y ont été connus de la plus haute antiquité: ainsi il n’y a point de témérité

“ à croire que les Arabes les auront pris à la  
 “ source commune.”

There are some facts, with which you seem to be wholly unacquainted, and which induce me to believe, that the Arabs did not copy their zodiac from the Greeks, and that if they did not take it from a yet more ancient source, they obtained it from the Indians. I am likewise led to think, that all the great Oriental nations had a double division of the zodiac in 12 and in 28 parts; and there are some circumstances, which I find it impossible to reconcile with the notion, that the Arabs copied these divisions from the Greeks. It seems, indeed, impossible, that they could have followed the Greeks in some of the arrangements of the stars in their configurations. Thus the sixth *Manzil* is called *الهنا* *alhanah*, and is placed in the feet of the second *Twin*; but the word signifies *the curve of the*

*neck.* It seems clear from this, that the configurations could not have been the same in the Greek and Arabian zodiacs in this instance. Again, the Arabians call the sign of the Twins *الجوزا algieuze*, which name has not the least reference to the Greek denomination. In the catalogue of the signs, I likewise find, that *Pisces* is denominated *جوت haut*, or *hut*, *piscis*; and in an ancient Indian, as well as in an ancient Egyptian zodiac, the sign of *Pisces* is represented by a single fish. These partial dissimilitudes strongly corroborate the supposition, that the Arabs did not originally derive even the 12 zodiacal signs from the Greeks; for if they copied, why did they not copy entirely?

But you boldly assert, that the Arabic names of the stars are derived from the Arabian astronomers, who in the 9th Christian century obtained their information from the Greeks; and



you accuse the author of the *Edipus Judaicus* of anticipating these names by 2500 years. That your assertions are unfounded, and that your accusation is unjust, I conclude from the following reasons.

1. If the Arabians, as Alfargani declares, and as Montucla even does not deny, divided the zodiac into 28 parts, at a very remote period of antiquity, it seems scarcely possible, that they should not have had names for the stars and constellations.

2. Out of the names of the *Manzils* transmitted to us by Abenragel, Ulug Beig, and others, there are some which relate, and others which do not relate to the figures of the Greek zodiac; whence it may be concluded, that the Arabians did not follow the Greeks; but had the names already adapted to their own configu-

nations of the 12 signs, most of which indeed conform with the plan of the Greeks.

3. The Arabian astronomers have occasionally, though rarely, adopted Greek names of constellations. Thus the two stars commonly called Castor and Pollux, but sometimes Hercules and Apollo, are occasionally denominated by the Arabians *افولون* and *عرتلس*—a manifest corruption for *Ἡρακλῆς* and *Ἀπόλλων*. But if the Arabians had not anciently had names for the stars, would they not have introduced many more Greek names into their catalogues? We find, however, that this is not the case; and an Arab would generally name Castor and Pollux, *سعد بلع*, (See Gignæus) without having recourse to any denomination obtained from the Greeks.

4. We may almost certainly conclude, that

the Arabs had given names to the stars in the days of Jacob, not only, because this had been done by other Oriental nations ; but because several constellations are named in the book of Job. This book is generally supposed to be more ancient than the Pentateuch, and its author is believed by some of the best critics to have been an Arabian, who consequently wrote in the dialect of his country. Thus then, I think, it will hardly be denied, that, according to every probability, the Arabians had given names to the constellations in the time of Jacob, since Job, an Arabian, who must have lived not far from the age of the Patriarch, names several constellations ; mentions the zodiac ; and alludes to the southern constellations which are not visible in Arabia.

Now, Sir, you insult the author of the *Œdipus Judaicus*, for supposing some of the Arabic

names of the constellations still employed, to have been (allowing for corruptions) in existence in the days of Jacob, 1700 years before Christ. Permit me to ask you, if the names of the stars and constellations, to be found in the Tables of Ulug Beig, &c. were either only borrowed from the Greeks, or were not in use among the Arabians until the 8th or 9th Christian century, how has it happened, that some of the first Oriental scholars, and that even Jews and Arabs, have thought that they found the constellations mentioned in the book of Job, by a reference to those Arabic names of the stars, which you are pleased to declare to be modern? How came Bochart, with all his vast erudition, to fancy that he had found *wy* corrupted, or altered, in the Arabian catalogues into نَعَشٍ? Had he lived in these days, and been instructed by you, he would have known upon your great authority, (*risum teneatis?*) that this last is merely a

modern name. R. Jona believed, that כסל was *Canopus*, altered in the Arabian catalogues into سهيل. He, therefore, did not suspect that the Arabian names of stars might not be traced to a remote antiquity; and this Rabbi was well skilled both in Hebrew and Arabic learning. But the learned Hyde himself—he who was the commentator of *Ulug Beig*—Hyde has sought for the names of the constellations mentioned in *Job*, in the Arabian catalogues. Had he lived to be enlightened by you, he would have been aware, that the names contained in these catalogues are all *modern*, or, at best, borrowed from the Greeks. It is clear, however, that Hyde did not doubt, that the names of the constellations in the book of *Job* might be found in the Arabian catalogues, and consequently he must have believed that many names of stars in these catalogues, were (allowing for corruptions) as ancient as the time of *Job*. Now *Job*

is generally supposed to have lived, at least 1500 years before Christ. M. Goguet, if I remember rightly, places him more than 1700 years before the Christian æra. What then is the result of all this? You positively assert, that the names of the stars in the Arabian catalogues are modern. If your assertion be true, then the shame of deplorable ignorance must be attached to the memory of the hitherto respected Hyde. He had deeply studied Arabian astronomy, and has written a commentary upon Ulug Beig. Did he know, or did he not know, that all the names of the stars in the Tables of Ulug Beig are comparatively modern? If he knew this to be the case, he must have reasoned like a fool, when he sought for the stars mentioned by Job among them, or have acted like a knave when he pretended to find what he sought. If he were unacquainted with the modern date of the names contained in the Arabian catalogues,

and it be really true that the date is modern, then the disgrace which is due to ignorance must be attached to Hyde. But, Sir, in your furious onset you probably did not expect to meet with the commentator of Ulug-Beig. You have copied enough from Lalande to make yourself sufficiently gaudy in your borrowed plumes. You talk of the Arabic translation of the *Almagestum*, as if you were familiarly acquainted with it. Do you know, whether this translation accord with the original, or not? I am assured that the Arabians have not followed Ptolemy exactly in his description of the armillary sphere ; at least so it appears from the epitome of Nassireddin. But the whole of your display is borrowed from Lalande ; while either forgetting, or not knowing, that that writer was only giving a brief account of the modern history of astronomy among the Arabians, you have unwarrantably referred to him, as sanctioning

your assertion, that the names of stars and constellations in the Arabian catalogues are not of more ancient date than the time of Almoman. Now if your assertion be true, how came Hyde to look for the names of the constellations which are found in the book of Job among names that are comparatively of yesterday? He is as deeply involved in the question as the author of the *Œdipus Judaicus*, on whom you have pronounced sentence; but that your sentence is not just—that it is founded on the rash conclusions of your own ignorance will appear, Sir, from due enquiry, and will be the final decision of the learned.

You are pleased, in the next place, to inform your readers, that “the Persians were probably more recent astronomers than the Arabians. Ulug Beig,” you add, “whose tables are given us by Hyde, lived about A. D



" 1430." Yes, Sir, I believe that he *lived* about 1430, since this might have answered to one of his early years ; but when you read in Lalande, that Ulug Beig introduced the astronomy of the Arabians among the Persians, you ought to have recollected, that Lalande was speaking of the modern history of astronomy with regard both to the Arabians and to the Persians. If you mean any thing, you mean, that the Persians had never cultivated astronomy, in any age, until Ulug Beig introduced the science at Samarcand — that they had no zodiacal divisions, and had no names for the stars and constellations. This is the only way, in which your statement can be understood as answering, or applying to the arguments of the author of the *Œdipus Judaicus*. What will the readers of Hyde, Anquetil, and Bailli, think of this ? The Persians, according to Bailli, had established the solar year—had divided the zodiac—and

had constructed a sphere, more than three thousand years before Christ. Be this calculation just, or not, it can hardly be conceived, that the great astronomical skill of the Chaldeans was not shared by the Persian *Magi*; and the name of Zoroaster alone might have recalled to your recollection the astronomical knowledge for which the Persians were once celebrated. Did you never hear of the caves of Mithras? Did you never hear of the astronomical emblems which embellished them? Do you remember what Celsus told Origen? Do you recollect, how Hyde himself, who unguardedly admitted in one of his works, that the Oriental nations, with the exception of the Chinese, had derived the forms and names of the 12 signs from the Greeks—do you recollect, I say, how he explains the words of Jerom, relatively to these emblems? But why should I waste words on the subject—the question was one which you

had never considered, before you sat down to write.

It is, indeed, but too evident, that in your haste to assail the author of the *Œdipus Judaicus*, you undertook to discuss subjects, with which you had no previous acquaintance. Seeing a great deal about Arabian and Persian astronomy in the work which has given you so much offence, you hurried away to the College Library, and looked out in Lalande for some account of the matter. There you found a short detail of the *modern* history of Oriental astronomy. All this was quite new to you ; and you speak of things, and names, and dates, of which you never heard before in your life ; and then confidently appeal to Lalande for assertions concerning what belongs to the *ancient* history of Oriental astronomy, of which he has said little or nothing.

You commenced your hostilities, forsooth, with a generous feeling glowing in your bosom! What that feeling was cannot be doubted,—since your object was to destroy the moral existence and literary reputation of a man whom you hate. Let me conclude this short letter by telling you, that bigotry and malice will not suffice for the purpose. Some may suspect that hypocrisy is sometimes concealed under the mask of bigotry; and others may decide, that where there is malice there can be no honesty. In assailing your adversary, you have over-rated your own abilities. Yours is not the *vivida vis animi* which can please by talent, where it cannot illumine by knowledge—which can persuade by eloquence, where it cannot convince by proof—which can dazzle by wit, where it cannot vanquish by argument. I see in your writings abundant evidence of an overbearing spirit, of stubborn dogmatism, and of priestly

pride ; but little enough of the candour which might influence, or the justice which ought to guide, the pen of a Christian Advocate. You would be a persecutor like Gardiner, if you possessed his power,—and a High Priest like Laud, if you could obtain his dignity—you have all the intemperance of Warburton without his genius—and all the intolerance of Horsley without his learning.

I am, &c.

**VINDEX.**

July 1st, 1813.

LETTER VI.

---

SIR,

I now return to consider the strictures which you have made on the astronomical allusions supposed by the author of the *Edipus Judaicus* to exist in the 49th chapter of Genesis.

You examine what he has said concerning *Leo*, *Scorpius*, and *Cepheus*. He has stated, that *Cepheus* sets when *Scorpius* rises. Of course he meant in the latitude of Cairo—about 30°, N. L., to which at a rough guess we may also refer the site of the ancient Memphis.

Your observation is as follows : — “ I will just “ inform the reader,” say you, “ that this constellation (*Cepheus*) never rises or sets, even “ to an observer in Egypt.” You are, however, so obliging as to acknowledge, what you could not deny, that the crown and head of the figure descend below the horizon at Cairo. What is this then but a very frivolous piece of hyper-criticism on your part, when you insult the author for saying that *Cepheus* sets in Egypt when *Scorpius* rises? You say, that the crown and head only set at 30°, N. L. True; but who, unless for some particular object, or in an elementary book, would think it necessary to be more precise than Sir W. D. has been? Who would scruple to speak of the setting of *Bootes*, for example, at London? Yet it is true that the constellation of *Bootes* never sets entirely at London. Did you never hear of a figure called *synecdoche*? Did you never see a part

put for a whole? You pretend to be conversant with the language of ancient astronomers. How come you then to be ignorant, that in speaking of the risings and settings of the constellations, they frequently take a part for the whole, exactly as Sir W. D. has done? Look into the tables made out from Aratus and Hyginus, and you will find that *Cepheus* is named among the constellations which set, when *Scorpius* rises. Thus your objection is not only puerile in itself, but betrays your little acquaintance with the language of the ancient astronomers.

But you have the impudence to tell your readers, that Sir W. D. appears not to have the slightest conception of the existence of the precession of the equinoxes, and does not know that the pole of the equator has changed its place since the days of Jacob. On what grounds



do you build this charge? Why, truly, he has said (alluding to the latitude above indicated) that "*Cepheus* sets when *Scorpius* rises." You mean then, I suppose, that *Cepheus* did not set, even in part, at  $80^{\circ}$ , N. L. in the days of Jacob. Either you mean this, or you mean nothing. You admit, that the crown and head of the figure set at present; but the proper time to be referred to is the age of Jacob, 3500 years ago. Now what is to be concluded from this by your readers, unless it be, that you think that no part of *Cepheus* set in the days of Jacob; and that Sir W. D. from not knowing that the pole of the equator had changed its place, stated that the constellation sets in the latitude of Cairo now, without being aware, that this was not the case in the days of the Patriarchs? I believe it impossible for any reader to come to any other conclusion. But, Sir, it turns out a little unfortunately for your pretensions to astronomical

skill, that three times more of the constellation of *Cepheus* set in the latitude of Cairo in the days of Jacob, than happens to be the case at present; and this has taken place in consequence of that movement of the pole of the equator round the pole of the ecliptic, of which you have spoken with so much pretended knowledge. Sir W. D. has shown in his Essay on the Shield of Achilles, published in the CLASSICAL JOURNAL, that this must be the case. I have not that Essay to refer to, but I can make out my statement without its help. 3126 years ago the pole of the equator nearly answered to  $\alpha$  *Draconis*. 4100 years ago it answered still more nearly to  $\alpha$  *Draconis*. Then about 3500 years ago, it was between these two points; and this being the case a very considerable portion of *Cepheus* must have set in Egypt. Even in the time of Aratus, who flourished in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, at a more northerly

latitude than that of which we have been speaking, *Cepheus* set from the hand to the loins. I suppose the observations of Aratus to be calculated for Alexandria, at  $31^{\circ}, 10'$ , N. L. His words are —

ὁ δὲ δέεται ἡμῶς πρὸ

Ἀθροός Ὀρίων, Κηφένος δ' ἀπὸ χειρὸς ἐπ' ἱζόν.

Who is it now, Sir, that appears to have been talking of the pole of the equator having changed its place, and of the precession of the equinoxes, without having the slightest conception of the effects produced by them? You evidently believed, that no part of *Cepheus* ever set in the part of Egypt alluded to in the days of Jacob; and thinking so, you asserted that the author of the *Œdipus* did not know that the pole of the equator had changed its place. It appears, unluckily for your fame as an

astronomer, that the man, who has so unjustly charged Dupuis and Drummond with ignorance, has here proved his own to an extent which, considering his pretensions, will scarcely be, at first sight, credited. Three times as much, at least, of the figure of *Cepheus*, descended below the horizon, in the same latitudes of Egypt, 3500 years ago, as is now the case.

Sir W. D. states, that “ *Cepheus* rises, according to Columella, on the 7th of the Ides of July,” and then he observes, that “ thus this constellation comes to rise in a few days under *Leo*.” Upon this passage you display all your hyper-critical talents. You take care to say nothing of Columella; but you ask, “ what possible sense can be affixed to the words of Sir W. D.” Here you are pleased to state, on the authority of Bishop Horsley, I believe, that there are three different senses in

which constellations are said to rise, according to the expressions of ancient astronomers—they rise *heliacally*, or *cosmically*, or *achronically*. You then repeat the meaning of these terms from Bishop Horsley, or Chambers, no matter which. But, Sir, I must stop your career at once, by telling you, that these, though by far the most common, were not the only senses, in which, according to ancient astronomers, constellations were said to rise. You tell us, on the authority of Horsley, or of the Dictionary, that “constellations are  
 “ said to rise *heliacally*, when they begin to be  
 “ visible in the morning before sun-rise ; to rise  
 “ *cosmically* when they come to the eastern  
 “ horizon at sun-rise ; to rise *achronically* when  
 “ they come to the eastern horizon at sun-set.” You then observe that none of these senses will suit the expression before us. This is true ; but since you talk so much of ancient astronomers, you should know, that they did not limit them-

selves to the terms which you have mentioned, when they spoke of the risings of the constellations. Manilius says,

*At revoluta polo cum primis vultibus Arcos  
Ad sua perpetuos revocat vestigia passus,  
Nunquam tincta vadis, sed semper flexilis orbe:  
Ac Cynosura minor cum primâ luce resurgit,  
Et pariter vastusve Leo, &c.*

Now hear the comment of a bishop not inferior in learning to Bishop Horsley. *Quoniam infra horizontem non descendunt Ursæ, neque supra eum proinde emergunt, alius earum ortus ab astronomis quæsitus est. Tunc autem oriri dictæ sunt cum proximæ sunt horizonti, et infimum obtinent locum circuli quem circa potum describunt, jamque resurgere incipiunt.* Here then is a sense, in which constellations are said to rise, and of which you have taken no notice. Again, the words of Columella cannot be explained, if

the ancient astronomers invariably abided by the terms which you have mentioned. No part of *Cepheus* descended at Rome to the horizon, and therefore no part rose from it. Neither did *Cepheus*, in this example, rise *heliacally*; for on the 7th of the Ides of July, Columella says, *Cepheus vespere exoritur*. It is evident then, that the language of the ancient astronomers was not so strict as Bishop Horsley thought it, and as you wish to represent it, in order to give a colour to your cavils. The author of the *Ædipus* copied the expression of Columella, with whom I leave you to quarrel at your leisure.

Sir W. D. has said, you tell us, that "*Cepheus* being seen low in the horizon when the Sun is in *Leo*, may be figuratively said to be under the feet of the Lion." Your comment is, that "his assertion is *decidedly false*; for

" when the sun is in *Leo*, the constellation of  
 " *Cepheus* is seen higher above the horizon than  
 " at any other season of the year." Now, Sir,  
 in order to prove that Sir W. D. has asserted a  
*decided falsehood*, it was incumbent on you to  
 show, that he had said, that *Cepheus* was seen  
 lower when the sun was in *Leo* than at any other  
 season. He, however, has asserted no such  
 thing. He has not said, whether this constel-  
 lation were seen lower or higher, than at any  
 other period. He has merely stated, that *Ce-  
 phus* is seen very low in the northern hemis-  
 phere, when the sun is in *Leo*. If there be any  
 falsehood in his assertion then, it is in his having  
 made this statement. Now the northern decli-  
 nation of *Cepheus*, from the crown to the feet,  
 extends, I think, from about 56 to 90 degrees ;  
 and I should have paused before I accused  
 another writer of asserting a *decided falsehood*,  
 because he has said, that at 30° N. L. this



constellation is seen very low in the northern part of the heavens.

But, Sir, you have been pleased to misquote Sir W. D. ; and then to accuse him of asserting a falsehood. He does not say, that *Cepheus* is seen "low in the horizon," but "very low in "the northern hemisphere;" and with the declination which I have assigned to the constellation, this must be strictly true in the latitude of Cairo. Allow me to tell you, that had you not accused your adversary of infidelity, and thereby shut the ears of so many persons against him, you would not have risked either such a misquotation, or such an accusation.

It is perfectly true that *Cepheus* is at the meridian at midnight, when the Sun is in *Leo*; but let me assure you that he does not remain there till morning. The stars of his crown have,

I believe, about 56, or 57, degrees of northern declination, and by the time they have arrived at the meridian of Cambridge, have been descending for more than an hour and a half from it at Cairo. The ancient Egyptians were accustomed to the use of tropes, emblems, and symbols. When the Sun was in *Leo*, they would recollect, that at the moment when he came to the meridian at mid-day, the King with the sceptre, or *Cepheus*, would be, with respect to them, as much beneath the pole, as he had been above it the preceding midnight; and when the Sun's declination in *Leo* is taken with the declination of *Cepheus*, I see nothing improbable in the conjecture, that the King with the sceptre may have been symbolized as under the feet of the *Lion*. You say, indeed, that the figures are turned different ways on our celestial globes; but I do not conceive this remark to be of much importance.

You pressed to observe, that “ *Cepheus* and “ *Leo* are distant nearly  $180^\circ$  in right ascension “ from each other.” This is very loosely stated. I find, that the little asterism in the mantle of *Cepheus*, has only about  $121^\circ$  in right ascension above B in *Leo*. It is true, that E in *Cepheus* has about  $182^\circ$  above *Cor Leonis*. It is to this, perhaps, that you allude.

We have now another discussion on the word “ *paranatellon*.” You not only misinterpret what the author intended to express in his explanation of that word, but you bind him down to the signification of it which you have chosen to give and to approve. I have already acknowledged that his explanation of the term was obscure and deficient. — Obscure, because it admits the sense which you have affixed to it, and which was not that which the author meant to convey — and deficient, because even as he

himself intended to state it, all the various senses in which the word may be used, were not described. But, Sir, the sense, to which you believe it may be correctly limited, betrays your utter ignorance of its origin. The author gave his explanation of the word in a notice, which he avows to have been written in haste. Who is the critic, then, possessed of common candour, who, if he had found a term used in a different sense by an author from what his explanation of it in another part of his book seemed to authorise, would not have examined the various meanings which the word would bear. If he found, that the word would bear *all* the meanings in which the author employed it, nothing more would remain for him to do, than to assign the portion of blame which he might think due to an imperfect and inaccurate explanation, written in a hurry by the avowal of the author himself. But it is evident, that you hold

a paranatellon to be capable of bearing no other meaning, than a constellation which rises *beside* a sign, or which having set with it necessarily rises with it. This is clearly the sense in which you understand the author, and this is the sense which you approve as correctly given. That you should not know, that stars which set at the same time do not necessarily rise at the same time, may be more easily excused to you, than that you should be ignorant, that *para* signifies *contra* as well as *juxta*, and that consequently the paranatellon of a sign may be described as I have already done in a former letter. Instead, however, of looking for the various significations, in which the author has employed the word, in its own origin and composition, you limit its sense — adopt an explanation of it, which, as you understand it, turns out to be incorrect as well as deficient — and bind down the author to the meaning which you have assigned to it. All

the falsehoods, then, which you have attributed to the author, upon the subject of *Cepheus* being the paranatellon of *Leo*, will cease to exist, when the various significations which the word will bear are considered. But I shall now follow you in your comments.

The author says “ *Cepheus* comes to rise “ under *Leo*, of which it continues to be the “ paranatellon, until the Sun enters the sign of “ *Scorpius*.” Your remark is as follows—“ He “ here asserts then that *Cepheus* is at a certain “ time the paranatellon of *Leo*—that it ceases “ to be so at another time—and that the time “ of its ceasing is, when the Sun enters the “ sign of *Scorpius*. The first assertion is *false* “ in point of fact.” You then proceed to state the explanation of the word “ paranatellon,” as it is given by the author; and, with your understanding of that explanation, you show, what no

one will deny, that, if it be the true and only one, *Cepheus* cannot be a paranatellon of *Leo*. But, Sir, the explanation of the author, though admitted by me to be obscure and deficient, while it is pronounced by you to be correct, was not intended to convey the meaning which you have affixed to it. He certainly meant, that constellations rising *opposite* to a sign, while it was setting, or just set, as well as those rising *beside* it, were to be called its paranatellons. Without paying the least attention to the word itself, or not knowing how to derive it, you insist upon binding down the author to his explanation, and to that explanation as understood by yourself. Now, he clearly connected with the word both *conjunction* and *contrast*—two ideas, that the etymology of the word forces upon us as inseparable from it—“rising with” and “beside”—or, “against and in opposition to.” This was evidently in his mind when

he wrote the sentence which you have quoted. He had just been referring to Columella, who states, that *Cepheus* rises (I conclude at  $42^{\circ}$  N. L.) on the 7th of the Ides of July. But *Cepheus*, though above the horizon at sun-set, would be nearer to it in the latitude of Cairo, than in that of Rome; and if Columella could speak of the rising of this constellation at  $48^{\circ}$  N. L., an Egyptian, *a fortiori*, might have said, that, at  $30^{\circ}$  N. L. *Cepheus* was rising: Now in this sense, and in observing that Columella does not limit the risings of stars to their heliacal, cosmical, and achronycal risings, *Cepheus* may assuredly be called the paratellon of *Leo*—it rises over against, or opposite to, *Leo*; and as παρατελλων (whence our word) may signify either “to rise with and beside,” or “against and in opposition to,” I shall not hesitate to assent to the proposition that *Cepheus*, at the time described, is a paratellon of *Leo*.



“The second assertion,” say you, “is false in the nature of things.” This second assertion amounts to this, that for a certain season *Cepheus* continues to be the paranatellon of *Leo*. Now undoubtedly it would be false, if your understanding of the explanation of the term “paranatellon” were just, and if the meaning of this term were limited to the signification which you have assigned to it. But if Columella’s sense of the rising of a constellation be admitted, and admitted it must be by those who speak after the ancient astronomers, and if the obvious senses, which the word “paranatellon” will bear, be consulted, there is no difficulty in reconciling the author’s words both with truth and with the nature of things. He says, “*Cepheus* continues to be the paranatellon of *Leo* until the Sun enter the sign of *Scorpius*.” Now it is certain that from the time the Sun enters *Leo*, *Cepheus* might be seen in

Egypt, always at night-fall, rising to the meridian, until the time when the Sun was in *Scorpius*, and then at night-fall *Cepheus* would be seen at the meridian, and thence gradually declining night after night. The author then clearly meant to say, *Cepheus* continues to be seen, night after night, nearer and nearer, at the close of day, to the meridian, to which he is rising over against the sign of *Leo*, until about the time when the sun is in *Scorpius*, and when *Cepheus* is no longer seen at night-fall ascending to the meridian, but already there, or declining from it.

To every candid judge of the subject the whole case will probably appear pretty nearly as follows. The author of the *Œdipus* has not given so full, or so clear an explanation of the word "paranatellon," as he ought to have done; while you, only intent upon injuring your adver-

sary, have neglected to make yourself acquainted with the language of the ancient astronomers, and have betrayed such a want of knowledge as does no honour to your station. You were ignorant, that the ancient astronomers, as we have seen in the examples of Columella and Manilius, did not limit themselves, in speaking of the risings of the stars, to the terms which you have explained from Bishop Horsley, or the dictionary; and you seem never to have suspected, that *παρὰντιλλον* (whence *παρὰντιλλον*) may signify "to rise against, or in opposition to," as well as "to rise beside, or in conjunction with."

But, Sir, the most extraordinary part of the business is, that you should have declared it to be your belief, that the author's explanation of the word "*paranatellon*," as you understand that explanation, is perfectly correct. The

author did not mean to convey the sense which you have affixed to his explanation ; but you say, “ a constellation is then the paranatellon of a sign, when it rises or *sets* together with a sign.” This is the sense, in which you understand the author’s words ; and you pronounce this explanation to be perfectly correct ! Now who is it, I should like to know, that is here “ using terms which he does not in the least understand ? ” What, Sir, is a constellation to be called the paranatellon of a sign, because it *sets* together with a sign ? I am willing to refer the matter to all the Doctors, Bachelors, Graduates, and Under-Graduates of Cambridge ; and enquire of them, whether, or not, their Christian Advocate could have understood what he was talking about, when he said that he believed, that a constellation may be correctly called the paranatellon of a sign, when it *sets* with a sign ?

P.

The author, continuing to speak from the ancient astronomers, says, "the King with the sceptre (*Cepheus*) sets about the time when *Scorpius* rises." Your comment is as follows — "Does he mean to speak of the time of the year when the Sun is in Scorpio, or of the time of day at any particular season when Scorpio comes to the horizon? Let him mean which he will, his assertion is equally *false* and *absurd* in the nature of things." I will venture, however, to answer for the author, that he meant to speak of the season, when the stars in *Scorpio* begin to rise above the horizon in Egypt. Now what is the period when, in that country, the greatest portion of the figure of *Cepheus* (which sets there at all) may be reckoned as either set or setting? It is, I should think, pretty nearly about the time when the left claw of the Scorpion rises. Now the ancient astronomers, from whom the author was

speaking, did not hesitate to say, that *Cepheus* sets when *Scorpio* rises; and then you, truly, come forwards, and abuse him, as if he were imposing, *de son chef*, something that never was heard of before on his unsuspecting readers. You say, that he has asserted what is false and absurd, because he has observed that, in Egypt, *Cepheus* sets about the time when *Scorpius* rises. If you can have any sense of shame, you will feel it when you turn to the pages of Aratus. There you will see, that *Cepheus* is said to set, when *Scorpius* rises. You may then turn to the tables made out from Hyginus, and there you will find these words, *Orto Scorpione, Cepheus occidit*. Lastly, you may consult the celestial globe of Senex\*, and having rectified it for 30° N. L., you will perceive that the crown of

\* I particularly mention this globe for a reason, which will be stated in a succeeding Letter.

*Cephus* has just set, and the *Little Star* at the point of the *Sceptre* is about to set, when the *Claw* of the *Scorpion* rises. We now see, however, with what justice, accuracy, and learning, you have accused Sir W. D. of asserting what is *false* and *absurd* in the nature of things. We now see, who it is that can insult and abuse another writer in the grossest terms of scurrility, without having the least acquaintance with his subject. But I will condescend to say no more to you at present, than to tell you, what many will feel, that your book does you no credit, either as a Gentleman, a Scholar, or a Christian.

I am, &c.

July, 1813.

VINDEX.

## LETTER VII.

SIR,

THE author of the *Œdipus Judaicus* holds with the Jesuit Kircher, that the 12 signs of the zodiac were represented on the 12 standards of the tribes of Israel. For this you call him an infidel, and treat him as a Chaplain of the *Grand Mufti* might be expected to treat a *Giaur*.

“ I will consider,” say you, “ his discussion  
 “ on Jacob’s prophecy concerning Zabulon —  
 “ ‘ He shall dwell at the haven of the sea, and  
 “ shall be for a haven for ships ; and his border



“ shall be unto Zidon.’ All this,” you continue, “ is clear enough, as it has always been understood, a prophecy of the geographical situation of the tribe of Zabulon, whose allotment was to border on the Mediterranean, and also on the territory of Zidon.”

In this little sentence you have made two egregious blunders ; and have shown yourself to be utterly unacquainted with the geography of the Holy Land. The territory of Zabulon was not bounded on any side by the Mediterranean. The territory of Asher intervened between Zabulon and the Mediterranean. Neither did the allotment of Zabulon border upon Zidon. Part of Asher and Naphtali lay between Zabulon and Zidon, and these two last nowhere bordered upon each other.

You proceed : “ However, Sir W. D. is to

“ prove that the sign of Capricorn was allotted  
 “ to Zabulon, and therefore that the words of  
 “ this prophecy bore allusion to the sign of  
 “ Capricorn.”—“ He begins by expressing his  
 “ dissatisfaction at the translation of the He-  
 “ brew text. He says, it ought to be translated  
 “ ‘ a haven for a ship,’ not ‘ a haven for ships.’  
 “ The word translated ships is מִנִּיחַ. In regard  
 “ to this word, he says, ‘ a masculine noun  
 “ ending in י, and assuming a feminine form  
 “ in the singular, takes ת final rather than ה.  
 “ Thus מִנִּיחַ is the regular feminine singular for  
 “ מִנִּי, though sometimes written מִנִּיחַ.” In  
 “ answer to all this,” you continue, “ I have to  
 “ observe, 1st, that if he had known a little  
 “ more of the language, which he pretends  
 “ critically to discuss, he would have discovered  
 “ that מִנִּי is *not* a masculine noun: it is common  
 “ in gender; he may see it used as a masculine  
 “ noun at 1 Kings, x. 11, and as a feminine

“ noun at 1 Kings, x. 22. 2ndly, that not only  
 “ has the word מַלְאֲכִים always been translated as a  
 “ plural noun in the passage before us ; but in  
 “ every instance in which the word occurs in  
 “ Scripture (nearly twenty times on the whole),  
 “ it is, and has been invariably translated as a  
 “ plural noun. (See Taylor’s Hebrew Concord-  
 “ ance.) Not to mention that many MSS.  
 “ have, in the passage before us, מַלְאֲכִים, the  
 “ regular plural of מַלְאֲכִי, as may be seen by  
 “ consulting Kennicott’s Hebrew Bible. So  
 “ much for our author’s *new translation* of this  
 “ Scriptural passage.”

You will see, Sir, that in making this extract  
 from your book, I have, in this, as well as in  
 other instances, taken the liberty to omit some  
 of the abusive and insulting language which  
 you have directed against my client. The repe-  
 tition of it might tend to irritate ; and your

critical discussions on the Hebrew language are always very amusing. There is a solemnity in your manner, while you go on from blunder to blunder, which, I can assure you, is very diverting.

I have seen, Sir, where you saw it, the word **אִם** marked as a noun common in Buxtorf's Lexicon, with a reference to the two passages at 1 Kings, x. In the passage at v. 22—**אִם נָשָׂא**—it is clear that **אִם** is joined with the participle in the feminine. But do you know why it is so? I fancy not, otherwise you would scarcely have talked as you have done. **אִם** is written here for **אִמָּה**, the **ה** being cut off before **נָשָׂא**. Accordingly Rumenius says, *אִם* *from. quando ponitur pro integro אִמָּה, scilicet—sic ה ante nomen נָשָׂא, abscissum est. 1 Reg. x. 22.* From this it results, that Sir W. D. is perfectly correct. **אִם** is a mascu-

line noun. When we find מַי joined with the participle in the feminine at 1 Kings x. 22, it is nothing else than the feminine form מַיִת with the ך elided. But you, having seen the word marked as of common gender in the Hebrew Lexicon, thought yourself safe in assailing the author of the *Œdipus Judaicus*. Now, had you possessed the slightest critical knowledge of the language, you would have been aware, that when מַי is feminine, the word is thus written for the feminine form מַיִת, with the elision of the ך.

You say, in the second place, “ that not only  
 “ has the word מַיִת always been translated as a  
 “ plural noun in the passage before us ; but in  
 “ every instance in which the word occurs in  
 “ Scripture (nearly twenty times on the whole)  
 “ it is, and has been invariably translated as a  
 “ plural noun.” You refer us to Taylor’s He-

brew Concordance. Really, Sir, it is rather too much to hear you abusing the author of the *Œdipus*, when you cannot stir a step yourself without making a blunder. The word מַנְּנִים is so written at Gen. xlix. 18, and has been always, as you say, rendered as a plural noun in this example; but how came you to assert so rashly, that the word מַנְּנִים occurs nearly twenty times in the Scripture, and has been invariably translated as a plural noun. You refer us to Taylor's Concordance. A man who writes with the avowed design of destroying the literary reputation of another should make himself sure of his facts. Out of the instances which Taylor has given, and I think they are exactly 19 in number\*, the word is written מַנְּנִים *but once*,

\* The passages referred to by Taylor are — Gen. xlix. 18. — Judg. v. 17. — 1 Kings, xiii. 48, 49, 49. — 2 Chron. viii. 18; ix. 21, 21; xx. 36, 36, 37. — Job, ix. 26. — Psal.

and that is precisely at the passage before us, (Gen. xlix. 18.) and in every other example it is written אֲנִי. Turn to your Hebrew Bible, Sir, and you will find that I am correct. Then what is to be thought of you, for thus asserting, that אָנֹכִי occurs in all these passages, and is translated as a plural noun? On the contrary, with the exception of the passage in question, the plural form אֲנִי, of which אָנֹכִי, or אָנֹכִי, is the singular, is uniformly found. What an example of ignorance and inaccuracy have we here exhibited by the man who has undertaken to write down the author of the *Œdipes Judaicus*! So much, Sir, for your Hebrew learning.

Having thus displayed your accurate ac-

xlviii. 7; civ. 28. — Isaiah, ii. 16; xliii. 1, 14. — Ezekiel, xvi. 9, 25. — 1 Kings, ix. 27. It is only in the first of these examples that the word is written אָנֹכִי.

acquaintance with geography and Hebrew, you  
 next favour us with a specimen of your chrono-  
 logical knowledge. No allusion, you think,  
 could be made in the 49th chapter of Genesis  
 to the constellation of the ship, called *Argo* by  
 the Greeks, because " Jacob delivered this pro-  
 " phecy about 1700 years B. C. ; and the expe-  
 " dition of the Argonauts, which gave a place  
 " in the sphere to the ship *Argo*, occurred,  
 " according to the earliest reckoning, about  
 " 1200 years B. C.—Thus, according to our  
 " author's sage observation, Jacob made allu-  
 " sion to the ship *Argo* as existing in the  
 " sphere, at least 500 years before it could  
 " have existed there." For whom can you  
 have inteded this argument? The Under-  
 graduates in your University will laugh at you  
 for it. " The expedition of the Argonauts gave  
 " a place in the sphere to the ship *Argo*." Now  
 if ever a legendary tale deserved to be treated



as fabulous and absurd, it is this story of the expedition of the Argonauts. But allowing it to be true, that 1200 years before Christ, Jason and his companions sailed from Pagasæ to Colchis, in search of the fleece of a golden ram, which ram was the son of Neptune, and had carried Phrixus and Helle, the children of Nephele, (a cloud,) through the air — allowing that this same Jason, who was descended from the God of the winds, and who had been educated by a Centaur, landed in Colchis, tamed two bulls with brazen hoofs and horns; sowed the ground with a serpent's teeth, which sprang up in the shape of warriors armed *cap-a-pie*; persuaded a monstrous dragon to swallow an opiate; carried off the golden fleece, and married Medea who was an enchantress; — allowing, I say, that all these things were true, I deny that the expedition of the Argonauts first gave a place in the sphere to the constellation of “the

“ ship.” That constellation was, indeed, called *Argo* by the Greeks ; but “ the ship ” could not have been *originally* placed in the sphere by the Greeks. A very considerable part of the constellation, and the bright star in it, *Canopus*, (an Egyptian name,) are never visible further north than  $40^{\circ}$  from the line, and could never have been seen by the Argonauts either at Pagasæ or at Colchis. And then you come with the chronology of Father Pettau in one hand, and the fable of Jason in the other, and tell us, that the expedition of the Argonauts, which gave a place in the sphere to the ship *Argo*, occurred about 1200 years before Christ ! No, Sir. “ The “ ship ” could only have been placed in the sphere by a people to whom this constellation was entirely visible ; and at Pagasæ, whence the Argonauts sailed, the brightest part of this constellation is never seen. Plutarch can give you a hint of the country in which “ the ship ”

was originally placed in the heavens, and of the people from whose example the Greeks represented Argo (if such a ship ever existed) in the sphere. τὸ πλοῖον, ὃ καλοῦσιν Ἕλληνες Ἀργώ, τῆς Ὀσειρίδος γαῖας εἰδωλον ἐπὶ τιμῇ κατηστερισμένον.

“ It will be found,” says the author of the *Œdipus*, “ that this ship descends under the horizon, when the Sun is in Capricorn.” You give your censures of this sentence in your usual style of coarse and vulgar abuse. You will be applauded for having done so ; but had you not accused your adversary of infidelity, even you, Sir, would have blushed to attack a sentence, which had been publicly corrected by the author himself, fourteen months before your book was printed. In the *CLASSICAL JOURNAL* for March, 1812, I find that Sir W. D. has amended this passage ; and then you, without paying the least regard to this amendment,

assail him as if it had never been made. Is this according to the fair laws of controversy? Would such an attack be suffered, much less sanctioned by the Critics, if you had not struck Justice dumb, by calling your adversary an infidel?

But think not, Sir, that I shall let you escape even with the miserable triumph of insulting an author for an error, which he had publicly corrected fourteen months before your libel against him appeared. You request your reader to adapt his globe for the latitude of Egypt (80° N. L.); and you tell him that "he will then find, that only a part of the constellation of Argo ever rises at all above the horizon; and that every part of it has actually sunk entirely under the horizon before Capricorn begins to rise." The globe, Sir, of which I generally make use is an old one made by *Senex*.

I prefer it to some more modern ones, in which I find that some stars, which were formerly reckoned as belonging to constellations, are excluded from the figures in which they were contained. This new arrangement may have its advantages; but it can only tend to embarrass us, when we speak of the constellations as they were known to the ancients\*. But, Sir, with the use even of a more modern globe, what am I to understand by your words concerning *Argo*? You assert, "that only a part of the constellation  
 " of *Argo* ever rises above the horizon at 30°  
 " N. L." To what class of readers could you be addressing yourself, when you risked this rash assertion? What, Sir, you, who affect to speak with so much astronomical knowledge, and who make such a parade of scientific accuracy — can you *never*, even by chance, make a

\* This is particularly the case with respect to the constellation of *Scorpius*.

statement, without committing a blunder? Had you not been so insolent in your pretensions — had you not so unjustly charged my client with ignorance, and loaded him with abuse — I should really have pitied you, and have left your errors to be *winked at* by the journalists. But when I recollect, that your object in publishing your book is avowedly to destroy the reputation of another, I cannot easily remit any part of the punishment which is due to your ignorance, to your arrogance, and above all to your malice. I take Jones's twelve-inch globe, and rectify it for the latitude of Cairo,  $30^{\circ}$  N. L.; and I do not find a single star in Argo, of which it can be said that it "never rises at all above the horizon." How then, Sir, could you assert, that "only a part of the constellation of Argo ever rises at all above the horizon in that latitude?"

You are next pleased to tell us, that "every

“ part of it (*Argo*) has actually sunk beneath  
 “ the horizon ( $30^{\circ}$  N. L.) before *Capricorn*  
 “ begins to rise.” This you say in the face of  
 Hyginus. Sir W. D.’s words, as they stand  
 corrected in the *CLASSICAL JOURNAL* for March,  
 1812, fourteen months before your last book  
 appeared, run thus — “ It will be found that  
 “ this ship (*Argo*) descends under the horizon,  
 “ when the sign of *Capricorn* rises.” Now I  
 turn to the small 12-inch globe, on which I find  
 the mast of the ship much shorter than on the  
 globe constructed by Senex, and consequently  
 less favourable to my client’s statement. But  
 even there I find, that when the star in *Capri-*  
*corn*, marked  $\mu$ , rises, several of the stars in  
 the mast, and even one in the poop of *Argo*,  
 have not yet set. Now, let me ask, to whom is  
 your own sentence to be applied with the greater  
 justice — to you — or to Sir W. D.? “ How  
 “ astonishing is it, that a person should be so

" injudicious (to say no more) as thus to hazard  
 " assertions, the falsehood of which it is in the  
 " power of every one, who examines at all what  
 " he says, to detect and expose !" Your Uni-  
 versity, Sir, is celebrated, and I believe most  
 justly, for the various branches of literature  
 which flourish within its walls ; but I have  
 always understood that the mathematicians of  
 Cambridge are peculiarly pre-eminent. What  
 will these mathematicians think of their Chris-  
 tian Advocate, who, while he is abusing and  
 insulting the author of an unpublished book,  
 proves his own ignorance and inaccuracy at  
 every word he says ? " Only a part of the con-  
 " stellation of *Argo* ever rises at all above the  
 " horizon in Egypt, at  $30^{\circ}$  N. L.," says the  
 Oracle. Go to your globes, ye mathematicians  
 of Cambridge ; you will find that they contra-  
 dict the Oracle, and, therefore, let me advise you  
 to set about constructing a new sphere. Again



the Oracle tells you, that “ *every part of Argo* “ has actually sunk *entirely* under the horizon, “ (likewise at 30° N. L.) before Capricorn *begins* “ to rise ;” but again the celestial globe contradicts the Oracle, and shows that a part of the constellation of Argo has *not* sunk beneath the horizon, when Capricorn begins to rise. Lose no time, therefore, I beseech you, ye disciples of Eudoxus and Hipparchus, in constructing a new sphere that will suit the new discoveries in astronomy, for which you have to thank your Christian Advocate !

From the subject of astronomy, you return to give us another display of your Hebrew learning. Upon this topic you are, at least, always amusing. The self-complacency, which is mingled with your ignorance, makes both the one and the other very entertaining. The author of the *Ædipus* says, that צִדִּיק may be translated “ the

“ great hunter.” You say, that there is no particle of authority for this, and leave your reader “ to his own astonishment at the hardi- hood of a person, who can propose to affix “ new meanings to words, according as the “ fancy strikes him, without the slightest “ authority.” Now, Sir, I should be glad to know, how you, in your wisdom, would trans- late ציד-נבר at Gen. x, 9. In our version we have it, “ a mighty hunter.” Again at Jer. xvi, 16, we have צידים “ hunters.” It appears then to me, that ציד, or צידן, is nothing else than צד with an intensitive ; and if it be so, “ a great “ hunter” is precisely the meaning of the word. Consult somebody, who knows something about the language, and you will learn that this account of the word is perfectly consistent with accuracy. The city *Tsidon* was so called from its founder *Tsidon*, the first-born son of Canaan ; and this son of Canaan seems to have received

his name from his occupation of "hunting." But truly Sir W. D. "affixes new meanings to" words, without the slightest authority." Why, I believe, Sir, if he had never read any books, but such as you have consulted, the range of his authorities would have been narrow enough. But look at the *Onomasticon* and at the *Lexicon* of Rasmelius. According to these authorities, צד signifies "hunting" — and בית-צד "the house of the huntresses." It is evident then that צד, "he hath hunted," is the root whence the author of the *Onomasticon* and Rasmelius derived צד. The city, however, was called Zidon, or Tsidon, from its founder, the son of Canaan; and it is obvious that his name was צד "venator," since it could be neither "venatrix," nor "venatio." Now, Sir, at whose hardihood is it, that we ought to be astonished? Sir W. D. had "not a particle of authority" for what he was saying! What an egregious

Oracle are you! I hope "the Bible Society," an Institution highly respectable, will consider of some new translation for נָבִי—נָבִי, and נָבִי, as cited above, in the next edition of the Scriptures. Some critics would make נָבִי signify "a robber, &c." and this would be highly convenient for you. In the mean time I will venture to tell you, that the sense given by Sir W. D. of נָבִי is perfectly consistent and accurate; while you manifest your utter ignorance of the elements of the Hebrew language, and yet have "the hardihood" to assume a tone to be expected rather from an Oracle, than from a sound and sober critic.

You go on to consider what the author has said concerning Dan—"Dan shall be a serpent by the way." The author observes, that "close to *Scorpius*, and by the Zodiac, which is "the solar way, we find the *Adder*, which is

" called *Coluber*, or *Serpens Ophiuci*." Your comment is as follows. " The Adder is *not* " close to Scorpius, nor *by* the Zodiac (he " should have said the ecliptic) which is the " solar way." Before I proceed to other matters, let me thank you for the pretty little cavil " he " should have said the ecliptic ;" but when you say, that the Adder is *not* close to Scorpius, nor by the Zodiac, I must desire you to look for the stars in *Coluber*, which are marked  $\eta$  and  $\xi$  on my small globe. You will then find that this part of *Coluber* actually dips into the Zodiac ; while one of the feet of the *Adder-bearer* rests upon the back of the Scorpion. You say, " the " tail of the adder, it is true, is delineated near " to Scorpius, but the head is distant from it, " not less than  $40^{\circ}$ ; and its direction is entirely " away from the zodiac and ecliptic." The first part of this statement is altogether incorrect. It is the belly, and not the tail, of the adder,

which is delineated near to the sign of *Scorpius*. If you will split hairs, you must take the consequences. It is nothing to the argument, that a part of this constellation is removed from the Scorpion. The belly of *Coluber* dips into the zodiac, or runs beside it, near to *Scorpius*, for about 20°. This justifies the expression of the author—The Adder is “a serpent by the way.”

You are pleased to admit, (what a satisfaction!) that the author is nearly correct, when he says, that “the head of the Adder ascends “about the same time with the feet of the Centaur.” How generous a concession! It has surely been in the gentleness of your nature, that you have shown the author any indulgence upon this occasion. You have insulted and abused him, it is true, when there was less reason; but though your keen eyes must have seen his error, yet in the fulness of your Chris-

tian charity you would excuse him for this once!  
 What a bright example do you give of the influence of that meek religion of which you are the Advocate! What a chastisement might you not have here inflicted on the suspected infidel; and yet you have forborne! Well did you know all the while, that, at 30° N. L., it is not the hind-feet of *Centaurus* which rise at the same time with the head of the Adder, but his left hind-knee! How could Sir W. D. commit such a palpable error! and how could your charity allow, that the *infidel's* statement was nearly correct! Why did you not insult him as usual, and abuse him for making an assertion which is *decidedly false*? Even I, Sir, who am his advocate, will not undertake to defend him here. While a knee is a knee, and a foot is a foot, I will tell him he is incorrect.—If he should laugh in my face, I cannot help it.—You must be convinced that I am not laughing in yours.

The author has said, "*Centaurus* rises heliacally with *Scorpius*." This once more excites your bile. You say that the expression "is perfect nonsense." "The only conjecture," you add, "at his meaning, which I can form, is that these constellations rise heliacally at the same time of the year." Here we have, indeed, a mighty effort of critical sagacity! I believe it is pretty obvious that this was his meaning — "*Centaurus* rises heliacally, or emerges out of the Sun's rays, about the same time of the year, with *Scorpius*." I cannot conceive any person to read the words, and not so to understand them; and thus I dismiss your silly cavil. But you tell us, that "if this be his meaning, it is erroneous in point of fact — the Centaur lies more westerly than the *Scorpion*; and therefore must rise heliacally some time before it." This is true if we speak of the head of the Centaur; but do you



mean to say that at the latitude in question no parts of the Centaur and the Scorpion rise heliacally about the same time of the year? I believe that the great star in *Centaurus* is visible a degree, or two, to the south of Cairo. It is more westerly than *Antares*; and as you are a *great* astronomer, Sir, you will oblige me by calculating by how much time its heliacal rising in the upper Egypt *precedes* that of *Antares*. Since it is more *westerly*, *α* in the Centaur, according to you, *must* rise heliacally some time before any part of the constellation of the Scorpion!

But a truce to these silly cavils, which you would not have ventured to make, if you had not reckoned upon the unpopularity which you have brought upon your adversary by accusing him of infidelity. You have made two objections, which are more important.

I find the following words in the Essay before us. "Perhaps the allusion may be to *Sagittarius*, followed in his descent by *Scorpius* and "the *Adder*." You attack the author for this sentence with much virulence; and accuse him of not knowing the order of the signs. Now, Sir, I think, it might have occurred to you, either that some mistake had been made by the transcriber, or that some interlineation had embarrassed the printer. I admit, however, that any such candid interpretation was not to be expected from you; but I must contend, that your attack is most unworthy and disingenuous. Fourteen months before your last libel appeared, the author had corrected this passage in the same Journal, in which his Essay appeared, and says "for *Sagittarius*, read *Centaurus*." Is it then just, or honourable — is it allowable in fair criticism to attack any thing that is marked as an error by the author himself, and

which has been corrected by him, without taking even the slightest notice of the correction? The author had it not in his power, as I believe often happens to those who write in the public Journals, to revise the sheets upon this occasion, or to correct the press. As soon as he had a proper opportunity, he corrected the error in the CLASSICAL JOURNAL for March, 1812. You may think, Sir, that I have no great disposition to spare you; and yet I should be ashamed of taking such an advantage as you have done. Your book is well and carefully printed; and I am assured that its author revised the sheets, and corrected the press. At page 11, however, I find "many parts of writings—is merely allegorical." At the conclusion of your preface we are directed to read *are* for *is*. What would be thought of me, if, without taking the slightest notice of this correction, I were to abuse you for being grossly ignorant of the grammar of

your language? How would your friends the British Critic and the Christian Observer treat me for such a proceeding? They would say, and say truly, that I had acted an unworthy part. You will tell me, perhaps, that the correction should have been made in the same Number in which the Essay was printed, and should have appeared in the *Œdipus Judaicus*. This could not happen in either case, because the author had it not in his power to correct the press for the *Journal*; and the Essay was printed in the *Œdipus* from the *Journal* with the introduction of one or two passages from the original MS., which had been omitted, probably in the hurry of publishing. When the *Œdipus* was printing in London the author was absent; and it was not until he saw it in that book, that he knew, that *Sagittarius* had been here printed for *Centaurus*. In November 1811, he wrote to the Editor of the CLASSICAL JOURNAL to desire the

mistake to be corrected ; and it was done in the March following, not in an obscure page, but in a letter published with the author's name. Your book appeared about the beginning of May, 1813 ; and yet you assail the author for an error, which he had publicly corrected considerably more than a year before, without taking any notice of that correction.

The next sentence which occurs is this : —  
 “ But the allusion will also apply to *Hydra*, a  
 “ paranatellon of *Scorpius*. *At etiam Centaurus*  
 “ *occidit cum Hydra. Hyg.*”

This passage has not been corrected by the author ; and, therefore, your objections to it must be admitted as fair. *Hydra* is not a paranatellon of *Scorpius*. The author desires me frankly to acknowledge the error. That the sentence has been mutilated, probably by some

words being left out in transcribing it, is sufficiently evident. The author cannot charge his memory with the exact defalcation ; but he thinks the sentence might have run — “ But the  
 “ allusion will also apply to *Hydra*, which sets  
 “ with *Centaurus*, a paranatellon of *Scorpius*.  
 “ *At Centaurus occidit cum Hydra. Hyg.*”  
 That a considerable portion of *Centaurus* rises about the same time with *Scorpius*, in Egypt at N. L. 80°, will not be denied ; and that the sentence is absolutely incomplete as it stands at present, and not therefore expressed as it was originally written, must be equally obvious ; but the author has not corrected it, and he must consequently leave it to others to decide, whether, or not, “ He has here either wilfully asserted  
 “ what is false, or through extreme carelessness  
 “ made an inconceivable mistake.” I will only observe for my Client, that those who know him will not suspect him of wilfully asserting what is

false. It is true, that a man, through extreme carelessness, may make inconceivable mistakes; but it is very improbable, that any man, who has common sense, should write what is altogether inconsequent and inconsistent. Who would, or who could, from any love of falsehood, or from any degree of carelessness, write such a sentence as that to which you object? In sense it amounts to this — “ But the allusion will also “ apply to *Hydra*, which rises near to *Scorpius*, “ for Hyginus tells us that *Centaurus* sets with “ *Hydra*.” Now putting aside the circumstance, that this statement is directly and obviously contrary to fact, in what is said of *Hydra* and *Scorpius*; it is utterly inconsequent and without connexion. I am, therefore, compelled to believe the author, when he tells me, that though he has neglected to correct it, the passage has been mutilated, probably in transcribing it, by the omission of some words. He thinks the

sense was this, as the words were originally written — “ But the allusion will also apply to “ *Hydra*, which sets with *Centaurus*, a parantellon of *Scorpius*, for Hyginus tells us that “ *Centaurus* sets with *Hydra*.” Let any person consider what was the drift of the author’s argument ; and let the strange inconsistency of the passage as it stands at present be considered ; and I think it will be generally allowed, that the sentence must have been mutilated, by the omission of some of the words. But the author must plead guilty to the charge of carelessness, in not having corrected this passage ; and from his not having done so, he must expect to be treated by you, and by those who think with you, as if he had neither common honesty, nor common sense.

It is not, however, I trust, from one solitary example of error, even if this could in strict



justice be charged against the author, that he will be condemned by enlightened readers. Let the long catalogue of charges, which you have exhibited, be examined, and it will be found that there is but this last charge, (which reduces itself to this, that he has suffered a mutilated passage to remain unamended,) which can be fairly brought against him. Almost all the charges, which you have hurled at his head, have been made to recoil upon your own. And now, Sir, what a figure do you make! You undertook to destroy the literary reputation of another man, and you have blasted your own in the attempt. Your book is a chaos of blunders — of blunders which you have made for your adversary, and of blunders which you have made for yourself.

A word upon the constellations which you deny to have existed in the Egyptian sphere.

With respect to *Cepheus* I shall refer you to what Sir W. D. has said on that subject in his *Essay on the Shield of Achilles*, published in the *CLASSICAL JOURNAL*. Sir W., however, desires me to direct your attention to the zodiac of *Esné*; and to observe the figure depicted there behind the *Lion*. As you have obtained a copy (you best know by what means) of the *Œdipus Judaicus*, you will have no difficulty in complying with this request. As to the authority of good Bishop Tattius, whom you quote, I think Sir W. D. has shown its value in the above-mentioned *Essay*.

You cannot find the ship *Argo* in the Egyptian sphere. No, Sir, most likely not; but you will find there the boat, or ship of *Osiris*, from which the Greeks took the hint of placing *Argo* among the constellations.

With respect to *Centaurus*, I shall only say at present, that the form of a Centaur was originally of Egyptian invention. The representation of *Sagittarius*, on the monuments to which you allude, might have convinced you of this.

It is not my intention, Sir, to address any more letters to you at present. You will see, that in those which I have already written, I have followed you closely, and have never flinched from the combat. Where my Client had really committed mistakes, I fairly avowed them ; and as he makes no pretensions to infallibility, I have no fear of losing my credit with him for having done so.—But, Sir, I err much, if I have not shown sufficiently, that your exaggerations of the faults, into which Sir W. D. has fallen, are without example malignant and extravagant. I likewise am much mistaken, if I have not made a pretty full exposure of your own

ignorance and arrogance. I now resign the pen to my friends *Biblicus* and *Candidus*, who think with me, that your last libel is disgraceful to you as a scholar, as a critic, and as a Christian. If you have been promoted in your profession, I must hope that it has been for the exercise of some better qualities than you have exhibited in your book, which is, without exception, the most rancorous and scurrilous production I ever read. You accuse the author of the *Œdipus Judaicus* of being an infidel, and of writing against the Christian religion. To this charge he pleads — *not guilty*. But were he an infidel — had he written against Christianity — was it by abuse the most vulgar, — by invectives the most scurrilous, — by charges of ignorance the most unjust, — by accusation of errors most frequently unfounded — that a Christian Advocate ought to have assailed his opponent? Was it with weapons such as these, that he should have defended

his sacred cause? But you accuse the author of ridiculing the Holy Scriptures. Were this accusation true, would it be by the brawling clamour of vulgar abuse, that you could hope to silence him? You have, however, in great measure abandoned your attacks on his religious opinions, and have almost entirely filled your book with charges of literary delinquency. What could be your object in this, unless it were to destroy the reputation of Sir W. D. as a man of letters, while you exalted your own character for learning and science? The enlightened men of your own profession, Sir, will probably think that the Christian Advocate was not called upon by his duty to exhibit, at such length, either his own scientific knowledge, or the want of it in his adversary; and they may, perhaps, have seen with regret, that in the important situation which you hold, you should have yielded yourself so entirely to the suggestions not only of

rage, but of vanity. It is but too obvious, indeed, that you desired, not only to take a direful revenge on Sir W. D., whom you believed to be the author of my former Letters to you, but to make a gorgeous display to the world of your own literary and scientific acquirements. Enjoy, Sir, while it may last, your imaginary triumph. Short are the brilliant dreams of self-delusion. The Letters of *Vindex* will blow to shivers the fabric of your vanity. The accusations of ignorance and arrogance which you directed, with such a fierce regard, and with such a feeble aim, against your opponent, are about to be retorted with tenfold vengeance on yourself. Yes, Sir, these Letters will prove, that, with all your vast pretensions, you are ignorant of the very elements of Hebrew learning; and that while you were charging your adversary with ignorance of the science of astronomy, you were not only generally unjust in the particular

accusations which you brought against him, but were yourself frequently guilty of blunders which a man of science could not have committed, and of which a *tyro* might have been ashamed.

You may now, Sir, proceed to write more libels against Sir W. Drummond. Your friends and admirers, the Christian Observer, and the British Critic, may again abuse the *Œdipus Judaicus* without having read it, and without choosing to listen to any vindication of it — nay without even hinting that any vindication of it has ever been made. I cannot think, that such a conduct quite coincides with the duty which Reviewers owe to the individual whom they condemn, — to the public — or even to themselves. To pass sentence on an unpublished book, which it is evident they never saw, on the authority of the accuser, who confirms his charges by the help of a few garbled extracts, does no credit to

the impartiality of these literary censors. But the clamour, which they, or you, may raise against the author, will, if I know him well, disturb him no more. The lesson, which you have received from me, will, I trust, prove a useful correction to your pride. In your future controversies with new antagonists, you will, perhaps, remember, with advantage to yourself, the severe chastisement which you have received from my hands. You will then probably be aware, that insult and invective can avail you little ; for you have now seen, that your arrogance has been treated with scorn, and that your insolence has been punished with contempt. A pedantic manner, and a loud tone, may impose upon the young, and fill the timid with dismay ; but learn, Sir, ere it be too late, that there are men who dare to think for themselves, and who are neither to be awed into humility by the scolding of an



angry bigot, nor to be frightened into submission by the blustering of an Academical bully, who talks big while he says nothing.

I am, &c.

July, 1813.

*VINDEX.*

**TWO LETTERS**

**IN ANSWER TO**

**THE REV. MR. D'OYLEY;**

***BY BIBLICUS.***



## LETTER I.

SIR,

HAVING read the *Edipus Judaicus*, written by SIR WILLIAM DRUMMOND, (a work never published; a few copies only being taken off, intended as presents to his friends, in order to avoid the trouble and difficulty of transcribing the characters of the eastern languages, of which, it is allowed by those capable of judging, Sir W. possesses considerable knowledge) — I am not the only one, believing the scriptures to be divinely inspired, and feeling that reverence for them, which has grown up with me from my early years, — I say, I am not the only one who

has been highly gratified with the learning and information contained in that work. But, how was I astonished when I read your answer to that learned production, criminating the author as an infidel, who thought he was paying a high compliment to the Bible and the sacred writers, by proving that it contained a fund of science, as well as being of divine origin. I say criminating the author—not in the spirit of the Scriptures, nor consistently with the character of the Christian Advocate, but in language, as has been justly observed, “fraught with all that bitterness of soul, which characterises the spirits of the bottomless pit.” I shall therefore make a few remarks in order to ascertain, as you have accused Sir W. D. of ignorance, whether you are justified in fixing that badge upon him, for if what you have so liberally advanced be true, he has been spending his time to little purpose.

You have made a few attempts at Hebrew criticism ; I am sorry to be under the necessity of showing how utterly defective you are in a language you have presumed to understand ; but it is necessary, lest those who are unacquainted with the language should be led into error, by giving you credit for what you do not possess, viz. an intimate knowledge of the original.

You remark that Sir W. D. in his comment on the word יריחו *Jericho*, says, " it is evidently " derived from ירח *the moon*, but as it is written, " with the Van, it becomes a collective noun, " and must mean the moon in her different " quarters." Well, Sir, and what objection can you or any man have to such an application of the word ? It must argue great ignorance indeed in the *Christian Advocate*, so called, not to know that the people of *Jericho* were

worshippers of the moon! and worshippers of that luminary too in her different quarters. The word ירח also means a synodical month; and the influence of the Moon in her different quarters was noticed by the sacred writers. *Deut.* xxxi. 14. *And for the precious things put forth at the lunations, ירחים or different quarters of the Moon;* for this is the meaning of the plural noun. Sir W. D. therefore is perfectly right in applying the word ירח to mean the Moon in her different quarters.

You object to Sir W. D.'s definition of the word חִיטִּים *Hivites*, and say, exultingly, "Now let us hear Sir W. D.'s commentary." "The Hivites appear to be worshippers of the serpent, more generally called Ophites. The idolatry of these Ophites was extremely ancient, and was connected with Tsabaism. The great constellation, which we call Hydra,

' is named חִיְוִי *Hivia*, by the Chaldeans.' To  
 which you reply — " Perhaps Sir W. D. does  
 " not know, that others before him have *fancied*  
 " the name derived from the Chaldee word sig-  
 " nifying *serpent*, because the people lived  
 " under ground in caves like serpents. If he  
 " will make it probable that this people really  
 " worshipped the constellation Hydra, which  
 " he is pleased to assume," &c. What objec-  
 tion can you have to the Hivites being worship-  
 pers of the serpent? No objection, certainly,  
 if you had understood the meaning and applica-  
 tion of the word. The very same word in  
 Chaldee with the customary difference in the  
 termination, means *a serpent*. Now, as we  
 know from the Bible, that the serpent was wor-  
 shipped in Palestine, and as this word signifies  
 one of the properties for which the serpent is  
 more noted than any other creature; Sir W. D.  
 is undoubtedly right in asserting that the Hivites



were worshippers of the serpent. It shows that he possesses no small degree of knowledge concerning the customs of those ancient people.

In your attempt to criticise on the Hebrew names of the seven nations exterminated by Joshua, (and a silly attempt it is, for no such extermination is said in the original Hebrew to have been commanded, or ever took place,) you have the astonishing assurance, with the smattering of Hebrew you possess, to say, "I will take as an instance, which will serve to display the author's merits, his observations on the names of the nations exterminated by Joshua. The *Canaanites*, the *Hittites*, the *Hivites*, the *Perizzites*, the *Girgashites*, the *Amorites*, and the *Jebusites*." Had you, Sir, been capable of ascertaining the true meaning of the above seven words in the Hebrew, with their application, and of showing us how it was

that they describe the *seven ruling properties of the serpent*, for which this animal was worshipped by these ancient people ; you then would have been able to determine the true meaning of those passages, well understood by the sacred writers where they mention the beast with *seven heads* ; and why the Hydra was placed in the sphere and worshipped\*. But, Sir, I have one word more before I proceed. Do not suppose that Sir W. D. is the writer of this ; he is a gentleman of too much modesty, possessing too great a degree of sensibility to speak of himself as I shall feel justified in doing. Believing in divine revelation, I come forward, Sir, as the defender of a man who has been doing more for the honour of the Scriptures and true religion, by endeavouring to strip off the mask of incon-

\* See BELLAMY'S Ophion ; and his Biblical Criticisms in the *Classical Journal*.

sistency, contradiction, and impossibility, which in the translation stares us in the face, till we blush to call them sacred, than has been attempted by the supporters of bigotry and superstition for ages. In the name of common sense, and common honesty, let me ask, if you believe that the great and incomprehensible Jehovah, of whom it is most beautifully said, *the heaven and heaven of heaven cannot contain thee, literally descended* to the earth with two angels, as is stated in the translation, (though no such circumstance is to be found in the original,) and dined with Abraham? But admitting this to have been so; what difference can it make whether Sir W. D. had said, he ate of this or that particular thing? The translations say that Abraham set a calf before them, bread, butter, and milk. A learned writer, Dr. ADAM CLARKE, whom, I believe, all that know him will acknowledge to be a good man, in

his commentary on that passage, has said, that " Abraham made a splendid entertain-  
 " ment for the three Angels. He set a whole  
 " calf before them, new bread but baked on  
 " the hearth, together with butter and milk.  
 " Three measures of meal were baked into  
 " bread on this occasion, which comes to more  
 " than two of our bushels, and nearly to fifty,  
 " six pounds of our weight; whence we may  
 " conclude that men were great eaters in those  
 " days, were probably of a much larger stature,  
 " as well as longer lives than we. Homer  
 " makes his heroes great eaters. When *Eu-*  
 " *meus* entertained Ulysses, he dressed two  
 " pigs for himself and his guest." If there be  
 any thing improper in Sir W. D. stating that  
 the three immortals dined with Abraham, he  
 has not gone so far as this writer, by asserting  
 indirectly that they were " great eaters." Why  
 did not you, Sir, as Christian Advocate, attack

the above writer? Why? because he was not of sufficient consequence in life to answer your purpose — he was not the ladder by which you could climb over the wall into the fold of the Church. Instead of the whale swallowing Jonah, Dr. CLARKE might have asserted that Jonah swallowed the whale, and you, no doubt, would have been perfectly silent,

Surely it does not follow that, because references have been made to the science of Astronomy, the theological sense, or the natural history should be destroyed — perhaps some learned Hebraist, (not one like you, Sir, who evidently do not understand the alphabet of the language and its application,) I say, perhaps, some learned Hebraist, who shall have attained a knowledge of the elements of the language, may show us, that a perfect knowledge of anatomy may be acquired by studying the original

Scriptures, of which abundant proof may be given. But would any man, calling himself a gentleman, (putting the sacred character of Christian Advocate out of the question), be justified as a man of honour, in declaring that such a writer is an infidel?—an enemy to religion?—that he denies the historical sense, because he has attempted to prove that a system of anatomy is to be found in the Bible? As well may we say that a man is an infidel because he asserts what is true; viz. that the word אַבְרָהָם *Abraham*, contains the exact number of bones in the human body; and so for other words of similar import. Many eminent writers have supposed that a knowledge of all the sciences was to be obtained from the Hebrew Language. Among the number of learned men who have been of this opinion we find Sir W. Jones and Mr. Hutchinson. But were you to pronounce your anathemas against Mr. Hutchinson, Sir W. Jones, and others, as

you have against Sir W. DRUMMOND, for the same reason, declaring them to be infidels, enemies to religion, and that they denied the historical sense of the Scriptures; no man in his sober senses, none but those who were intoxicated with bigotry and superstition, which swallow in their mighty vortices reason, learning, and stubborn facts, would believe you. It would be absurd to suppose, that because these things were possible, the historical sense was destroyed. Surely a consideration of this nature must have a powerful tendency to prove the divine origin of the Scriptures. The language of heaven, which comprehends all knowledge, must be of this description. It does not appear to me, nor will it to any honest man, that Sir W. D. rejects the historical account of the Scriptures. You, Sir, ought to blush for your unparalleled assurance, and if you had either grace in your heart, or the manners of a gentleman, "Shame would burn your cheek to a cinder,"

when you hear him say, "It would be equally rash and irreverent to express any doubts of the historical truths."

I have one remark more to make before I quit this part of your pamphlet. In all my reading I have not met with any thing of so dangerous a nature, and if it were true, so capable of subverting the religion of the Bible—no; not in the writings of the most confirmed Atheists, or Deists. And it is the more dangerous as it comes from the pen of a man having the high-sounding title of *Christian Advocate* in the University. You say, "It is known to every person, at all acquainted with the Hebrew language." The reader would naturally conclude from this bold beginning, that Mr. D'OYLEY understood the Hebrew Language. This, however, is a proud assumption, as the reader will be convinced by the proofs I have given, and



from the quotations I have made from the writings of masters, and those who are allowed to be critics in the language. To some it may seem strange, that gentlemen should thus commit themselves. But you, Sir, are not the only transgressor; we have witnessed a similar attempt. I have now before me the opinion of a professor in one of our collèges, who was referred to for his opinion of the new translation of the Book of Job, published by the Rev. Dr. RANDOLPH, who in a letter to that gentleman, says, "*It is a translation which conveys more of the true character and meaning of the Hebrew, with fewer departures from the idiom of the English, than any other translation whatever that we possess.*" When, as may be seen, in that valuable and learned work, the *Classical Journal*, which ought to be in the library of every scholar in the kingdom, the reviewer of the translation has shown, that the translator did

not even understand the grammar of the Hebrew language ; but like you, Sir, presumed to touch the hallowed ark with the palsied hand of ignorance, to give a false report of the land, and to comment on the sacred original, of which you are unacquainted, even as to the very rudiments.

But to return : — you say, “ It is known to  
 “ every person, at all acquainted with the He-  
 “ brew language, that many of the roots in it  
 “ have a vast number of derived senses, some-  
 “ times remote from the primary, or original  
 “ sense ; on which account the language is  
 “ peculiarly adapted to favour wild and fanciful  
 “ conjectures in etymology.” I am shocked at  
 this remark of Mr. D'OYLEY — what ! has God  
 communicated his will to man in so equivocal a  
 way, that the very language he has been  
 pleased to adopt, is *peculiarly adapted to favour*  
*wild and fanciful conjectures* ? Surely it is gross

blasphemy to say, as you have said, that God has communicated his will in a way which admits of a double meaning. Whatever you may outwardly profess, he must be blind indeed who cannot see that your profession is no better than hypocrisy, for the gratification of the basest passions, viz. pride, and the love of self. For from the above bold Deistical expression, no one surely can hesitate in pronouncing the Christian Advocate to be a confirmed Deist. Every man who does not believe that the New Testament is founded on the prophecies of the Old Testament, must be a Deist ; and as you have declared that the Old Testament in the original, “ is peculiarly adapted to favour wild and fanciful conjectures,” you deny the very foundation of the truths of the Christian religion, and say with all Deists, that, “ The Hebrew language is peculiarly adapted to favour wild and fanciful conjectures.” Thus, Sir, in the character of a

supporter, you deny the prophecies, and are sapping the foundation of the Christian religion.

The above remark of yours will convince every one who only understands the rudiments of the language, that you are completely ignorant of it, though you have had the assurance to insult your readers by passing yourself off for a Hebraist. No doubt *every Hebraist knows that many of the roots in the language have a vast number of derived senses, sometimes remote from the primary or original sense.* “Every Hebraist “knows,” (this sounds very learnedly,) “no “doubt:” you would here have it understood that you are one of those to whom you apply the words, “no doubt every Hebraist knows.”— You say, “many of the roots in the language “have a vast number of derived senses.”— This remark shows your depth in the knowledge of Hebrew. All the roots, my good Sir, “have a

" vast number of derived senses ;" but as you can only find the general meaning of a word by pondering over the roots in your Lexicon, (and even then you have no knowledge concerning the certainty of their application,) you have found here and there a word to which the Lexicographer has given one meaning, without giving its variety of application ; and not knowing how this is done yourself, you have unwisely said, " MANY of the roots in the language have a " vast number of derived senses."

Without going into an elaborate display of all the disgraceful errors you have committed in your futile attempts at Hebrew criticism, from the proofs I have given, one thing is obvious ; " every Hebraist knows" who has read your hotch-potch scrapings together of the few Hebrew words you have sported, higgledy-piggledy, in a heterogeneous mass, like Babel-confusion ;

without knowing any thing of their application ; I say, “ no doubt every Hebraist knows,” by this time, that you can lay no claim to that knowledge of Hebrew, which, for the credit of rational religion, and the honour of the Bible, is so absolutely necessary for every gentleman of your profession : but which I am sorry to say has been, and is most shamefully neglected by almost every candidate for orders. On this ground it is their duty to be masters of the original language for the welfare of the state ; in order that the objections of infidels may be answered, and which so far the honourable Baronet has been attempting in a way that does him credit. I have witnessed the good effect of the *Œdipus* in my circle, in raising those parts of sacred scripture which are inconsistent with the original Hebrew, to a higher degree of estimation in the minds of those, who, feeling a reverence for Scripture, have frequently been

hurt by a variety of passages as they stand in the present translation.

“ Sometimes remote?” Why the derived senses are always “ remote from the primary, or original sense;” in point of possibility, the derived sense can never be the original sense, otherwise it would cease to be derived. This remark of the Christian Advocate is downright nonsense. Equally clear is it that the derived sense always partakes of the root or nature of the stock from whence it is derived, otherwise it could not possibly be a derived sense.

Thus, Sir, having taken a few alphabet lessons from a necessitous Jew who runs down to the University in term time, you suppose yourself capable, by the help of a Lexicon, to talk learnedly, by sporting a Hebrew word or two, and foist yourself off for a critic in one of the

most difficult, but nevertheless, one of the most certain languages in the world. Indeed, Sir, I complain with Mr. BELLAMY in the *Classical Journal*, and say, ‘I am sick of the learned trash I meet with of this description.’ I shall conclude the remarks I have made on this part of your Letter by observing, that you, Sir, as the *Christian Advocate*, by the bad character you have given of the Hebrew Language, which you are evidently ignorant of, would do more injury (if credited) to the Bible and Bible Religion, than the writings of all the Deists. This concession of yours will certainly give fresh energy to the cause of Deism.

You have charged Sir W. D. with ignorance, saying, that *a person having acquired a trifling knowledge of the Hebrew alphabet, may, by turning over the leaves of the Lexicon, talk learnedly.* But this remark, Sir, cannot any way be



applied to Sir W. D. It may not appear to you, but it certainly will appear to the learned, that, though a person of this description may, like you, presume to talk learnedly, yet such a one, by turning over the leaves of a Lexicon, cannot, like Sir W. D., understand the grammatical construction of those learned languages he has introduced in the *Œdipus*, and others of his publications.

This is your method of understanding the Hebrew. Having found the root of a word, and its radical meaning, you blindly conclude, that notwithstanding the word varies by prefixes and suffixes, in order to distinguish the different cases of nouns, and the moods, tenses, persons, and genders of verbs, it retains the same meaning and application. I beg leave again to refer you to the CLASSICAL JOURNAL, where you will find that the above-named Hebraist has

shown, that the word דָּבָר, without any variation in the radical form, has about 20 different applications, according to its orthographical arrangement, and near 300 different modes of expression which are applied according to its prefixes and variation in termination. Thus, by not first qualifying yourself to write on the Hebrew Scriptures, you have blunderingly asserted that the word דָּבָר *Hittites*, does not mean worshippers of the fire; that יֵרֵחוֹ *Jericho*, has no relation to the worshippers of the Moon; that חֲוִיתָא *Hivites*, in like manner, has no relation to the worshippers of the Serpent. Indeed, Sir, I feel for the credit of the established religion with such a supporter; truly contemptible must you appear in the eyes even of the unlearned, when they see the Christian Advocate marching with solemn consequence in a borrowed garment, as completely ignorant of those things which he ought to be acquainted with, as the school-boy who has not

yet mastered his Alma Mater, is of the elements of the Latin language. Had you not attempted to pass yourself off by empty clamour for a profound Hebrew scholar, you might in the gown of the Christian Advocate have concealed your real character. Such a mass of unformed matter — such a cess-pool of pretended learning, I never met with in a man filling so important a situation. What information can the public expect to derive from the proposed commentary on the Bible, of which you have given notice, when you have afforded such proofs of your inability for so important an undertaking? I hope in that work, should you be daring enough to publish, you will not attempt to talk of *patronymic names*, — this is as strong a proof of your ignorance of the original language as any thing you have written: there are no names in Hebrew *primarily patronymic*, they were all given to express some quality, or propensity in the

subject. But I dare say the Hebrew critics will not suffer you to pass unnoticed.

I must not omit making a few remarks on your bold and unqualified assertion concerning the astronomical knowledge of the Egyptians, and the ancient Hebrews: and I do this in order to show that you are as deficient in the knowledge of the Scriptures in their translated form, as you are of the Hebrew. You say that “the Hebrews ascertained the time of the new Moon, only by the extremely rough method of watching for its appearance after its conjunction with the Sun. I do not dwell,” say you, on the high improbability of the supposition that the Egyptians and Israelites possessed astronomical science, or astronomical instruments, by which they were enabled to find the precise day of the Sun’s entering Aries, when we know that they could not find the

“ precise time of the Moon’s conjunction with  
 “ the Sun.”

It is said, Deut. xvi. i. שְׁמוֹר אֶת-חֹדֶשׁ הָאֲבִיב שְׁמוֹר  
*Observe the month Abib. Ver. 3. In the tenth*  
*day of this month, they shall take to them every*  
*man a lamb. Ver. 6. And ye shall keep it up*  
*until the fourteenth day of the same month. A*  
 little attention to these passages would have con-  
 vinced you that the Egyptians and the Hebrews  
 were enabled to find the precise day of the Sun’s  
 entering into Aries. They were commanded to  
 observe the month Abib, by celebrating the feast  
 of the passover on the fourteenth day of that  
 month. Now, Sir, would it not be absurd in our  
 government were they to command a fast to be  
 kept on any particular day of any month, if we  
 had not the means of determining that particular  
 day of the month? certainly. But by this rough  
 method of ascertaining the time of the New

*Moon, by watching for its first appearance after its conjunction with the Sun*, which you say was the only method they had of knowing, or guessing the time of the conjunction with the Sun ; if the weather had been unfavourable for such observation, they might not have been able to have seen the Moon for a whole month, particularly at this rainy season of the year, and then they could not have kept the feast of the passover in the month Abib. But, however, take it for a shorter time, that they had not been able to have seen the Moon for eight or ten days after the conjunction, they could not have kept the passover on the fourteenth day.

Again, they were commanded to keep the passover on the fourteenth day of the month Abib. Now, Sir, were you not as ignorant as a man I met with, who would not believe that the Sun was at so great a distance from the earth as

I asserted it to be, because, said he, no one has been up to the Sun to measure the distance; you would have known, that if the ancient Hebrews had not been as well acquainted with the science of Astronomy as the Europeans are at this day, and had not been able to have made the regular intercalations for the regulation of the year, in thirty-three years the feast of the passover would have been celebrated in every month as well as in the month Abib. From such a sample of your ignorances, I leave your superiors to judge how well qualified you are to fill the station of Christian Advocate.

You boldly say, page 67, " We hear nothing  
 " of any traditions subsisting among the Jews  
 " respecting the standards borne originally  
 " among the twelve tribes; and that during  
 " this period, we have several writings of weight  
 " and authority, as the Targum of Onkelos, the

"Talmuds, the works of Philo and Josephus,  
 "which convey to us all authentic traditions  
 "respecting Jewish affairs and history, but  
 "which are totally silent respecting the  
 "standards borne by the twelve tribes." Now,  
 Sir, the public will naturally suppose, as you  
 have referred to the Targum of Onkelos, and  
 the Talmud, that you must be so far conversant  
 with them as to know that what you have  
 asserted is true, that you have regularly read all  
 the large folio volumes of the first, and those of  
 the second, and that the reason you assert so  
 roundly that these great writers are "totally  
 "silent respecting the standards borne by the  
 "12 tribes," is, that you know it to be true,  
 because you have examined them. Indeed, Sir,  
 your presumption is unbearable; you merit the  
 contempt of every good and sensible man.—  
 Here is a man who is attempting to foist himself  
 on the public as a learned Hebrew scholar, who



pretends to have read the voluminous productions of the above-mentioned authors, — and yet who, so far from pointing out where those great Hebrew scholars have mentioned the standards of the 12 tribes, has committed himself, by declaring, they have not mentioned them in any part of their writings.

I hope you will not tell me that *num* does not mean an ensign. It is expressly said, that *every man should pitch by his own standard, with the ensign of their fathers' house*. Now whatever these ensigns were, whether they were the signs of the zodiac, which they brought with them out of Egypt, to perpetuate in their posterity the astronomical learning of their fathers, or whether these ensigns were chosen at random, without meaning, as seems to be your notion, though unknown in the Hebrew language, it is scarcely worth losing our time to determine. It is most

likely that they would pay attention to that order which was given them by their father Jacob in his particular designation of every tribe: and were it absolutely necessary, it would not be a difficult matter to prove from the Hebrew, that the 12 signs of the Zodiac were the ensigns on the standards of the Hebrews, who brought them out of Egypt. For whoever attentively examines the 49th chapter of Genesis, according to the Hebrew, will find that the signs of the Zodiac are described; they were ancient symbols, known to the first settlers in Egypt, which were communicated to them by the antediluvian patriarch; and Jacob, agreeably to the scientific learning of the Egyptians, applied these celestial symbols to characterise the 12 tribes. Where, in the name of wonder, can arise any evil from all this? — does it not add a degree of scientific knowledge to the Scripture, which is not to be so significantly found in any

other writings?—does it not strengthen their authority on account of antiquity, far more than if we were to suppose, as you have ignorantly supposed, that the constellations were invented by a miserable horde of petty, modern Greeks?

But you seem to forget that Sir W. D. is attempting to impress the mind with the scientific part of the Scripture, as far as it relates to astronomy—he does not deny the theological sense; and it is, Sir, an unpardonable crime, for which you must necessarily be held in contempt by every good man, for endeavouring to convey a contrary opinion. He says, “It remains to be enquired what is meant by “Shiloh: the answer in a sacred sense is obvious, but there is also an astronomical allusion.” These are Sir W. D.’s words, which ought to have convinced you, if you were willing to be convinced, that he has as high a veneration for

the sacred sense of the Scriptures, as the man who is raising all this false clamour against him ; and with regard to the historical sense, he says, " It would be equally irreverent to entertain any doubt as to the historical sense," as before observed. Now, Sir, I would ask what degree of credit can be given to a man who in the face of the public has the assurance, not only to pervert the meaning and intention, but also the very words, of an author, who has attempted to impress the mind with the learning, and sanctity of the original, by clearing away the rubbish with which ignorance, bigotry, and superstition, have covered the sacred Scriptures for ages. Whether Sir W. D. had declared that the Earth or the Sun was in the centre of our system, he must of course have been wrong, or it would not have suited your purpose ; if the latter, agreeably to the translation, you might charge him with *infidelity*—if the former, with

profound ignorance. But so long as you do not blush to declare in print, "that there happens " to be no such word as *ו* or *ו* signifying " time, in the Hebrew language," and that " the word *ו* *Hittites*, has no relation to that " people as worshippers of fire;" I despair of your being open to conviction: particularly as you flourish away by saying, " I have to inform " him." And yet you tell us, in order to get rid of this part as you have of the rest, that the latter part, viz. the application of the word to the Hittites as worshippers of fire, " must be " left to the decision of the reader."—A curious sort of language to be held forth by the Christian Advocate of Cambridge—" the copier" from the CLASSICAL JOURNAL, without acknowledging the source of his information—who being altogether incapable of determining this matter by giving a literal translation and application of the passage; like a dextrous juggler, who

shuffles his cards into the pocket of his neighbour, and passes for a conjuror, you get rid of it, and thus pass with those as ignorant of these things as yourself, for a man of general learning. Had you made such blunders in your Latin exercises, before you had escaped the trammels of school discipline, you would have had many a sound flogging. It is painful even to be accused of ignorance — more so if such an accusation be true ; but it must be peculiarly distressing to a man in your situation, were you capable of feeling, when, in addition to your want of knowledge, it is made to appear that you have had the boldness to pass yourself off as a critic in the Hebrew language. What must the gentlemen of learning and talent in the University think, when, while they see you stalking in your official robes, they see a man flourishing in the field of criticism, unacquainted with the grammar of the language he presumes

to understand. — From the above remarks it must appear even to yourself, how injudiciously you have acted, in vainly pretending to be intimately acquainted with that kind of learning, of which you have given such proofs of your unparalleled ignorance.

I am,

*BIBLICUS.*

## LETTER II.

SIR,

As it is meant that this Letter shall contain all the remarks necessary to be made at present on your Pamphlet, I will endeavour to be as brief as possible.

You object to Sir W. D.'s assertion, that "the Jewish passover was derived from an Egyptian festival; he must prepare," you observe, "for a still bolder method of proceeding." I have no doubt but Sir WILLIAM is prepared for that kind of proceeding which will expose your want of knowledge as to this subject



also. You then quote Sir W.'s words, who says, " St. Epiphanius says, that about the " vernal equinox the Egyptians had been accus-  
 " tomed, from very remote antiquity, to cele-  
 " brate the festival of the *ram* or *lamb*. At this  
 " festival they used to mark every thing about  
 " them with red." In reply to which you say,  
 " Now what must be the surprise of the reader,  
 " when he finds that this writer gives a most  
 " complete and thorough perversion of Epipha-  
 " nius's words, and that this author says not  
 " a single syllable about an *Egyptian festival*  
 " of the *Ram*, at which every thing was smeared  
 " with red."

I shall quote also that part of Epiphanius which Sir W. D. refers to, which is also men-  
 tioned by you, and leave the reader to judge  
 whether he is not justified in speaking of the  
 Egyptian festival of the Ram, as being prior

to the paschal institution, which existed from remote antiquity. " But of the lamb slain in  
 " the country of the Egyptians, there is still  
 " among the Egyptians celebrated a tradition  
 " even among idolators ; for at the season when  
 " the passover took place there, (and this is the  
 " beginning of the spring when is the first  
 " equinox), all the Egyptians through igno-  
 " rance take some red paint and stain the  
 " sheep, the trees, the fig-trees, and other  
 " things, saying, that, as is reported, on that  
 " day, fire totally consumed the world, but  
 " that the red appearance of blood is a preser-  
 " vative from such disaster." Surely, Sir, this  
 is enough to justify Sir W. in saying that at the  
 time of Epiphanius there was a custom among  
 the Egyptians of staining their *sheep, rams, or*  
*lambs*, with the colour of blood, at the season of  
 the passover, to avert some impending danger;  
 and which custom, at any rate, must have come

from the paschal institution when the Hebrews left Egypt. But I have a few words more to say on this subject, in order to show that Sir W. is justified in carrying the paschal institution to the "most remote antiquity." I therefore say in your own words, "Now what must be the surprise of the reader when he finds" that Mr. D'OYLEY, the Christian Advocate in the University of Cambridge, is so completely ignorant concerning the origin of the paschal institution, that he supposes it was first established in Egypt at the Exodus.

Is it possible, Sir, you should not know that this paschal festival had its origin from the most remote antiquity? A lamentable thing it is indeed to find that situations of emolument are given to men who even are at a loss to ascertain the origin of a festival, which was a type of the great passover. How little must you be

acquainted with the Bible, (which agreeably to a common phrase, if you did justice to your situation, you ought to have at your "fingers' ends,") not to know the origin of this "Egyptian festival," when *rams*, or *lambs*, were slain agreeably to the divine command. If you, Sir, will be at the trouble to turn to *Genesis*, iv. 4. you will find the origin of this "Egyptian festival:" *And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock, and of the fat thereof. And the Lord had respect unto Abel, and to his offering.* This, Sir, was the origin of the *paschal feast*, which was handed down through all the patriarchal churches to the time of Noah, when *the covenant*, that "paschal festival," was again instituted at the beginning of the second dispensation, viii. 20. *And Noah builded an altar unto the Lord, and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt-offerings*

*on the altar. It is there said, And I will remember my covenant which is between me and you.*

Now, Sir, we find that the descendants of Noah settled in Egypt, and there instituted the order of worship which comprehended this *paschal feast*; and though Sir W. Drummond has not in his *Œdipus* given the account of the origin of this *feast*, because he reasonably concluded that people of all descriptions, as christians, were well acquainted with it; he is certainly justified in saying, "that the Jewish passover was derived from an Egyptian festival." Therefore you see he is "prepared for a still bolder method of proceeding." And notwithstanding you flourish with self-confidence in your opinion, by saying, "I will give Sir W. D.'s own words;" he would have been just in asserting, that it was derived from a

*Nashot's festival*, or from the corresponding festival celebrated in all the patriarchal churches, which had its origin by divine command in the time of Abel.

Pray, Sir, how am I to understand you? You say, "It is evident that Epiphanius says  
 " nothing of an Egyptian festival of the ram,  
 " which Dupuis and Sir W. D. invented for  
 " him ;" — while Epiphanius himself says,  
 " That the Egyptians at the vernal equinox  
 " celebrate the festival of the slain lamb, by  
 " smearing the trees and other things with the  
 " colour of blood, in order to preserve them  
 " from some dreaded disaster." Now if you  
 have not asserted a downright untruth, to say  
 the best of it, in accusing and grossly abusing Sir  
 W. D. for quoting Epiphanius falsely ; there cer-  
 tainly is no meaning in words. Nothing can be  
 more plain than that Epiphanius says, *at the*

*vernal equinox the Egyptians celebrated the slain lamb, by smearing certain things with the colour of blood*—and this too as a religious rite, because it had been handed down to them from remote antiquity, (i. e. from the time of Abel) that blood, or the colour of blood was expiatory. And yet you abuse Sir W. D. by branding him with “*dishonesty and fraud, with scandalous perversion,*” which you add, “*will for ever deprive him of the confidence of every portion of the public,*” when it is evident that Sir W. D. is right, and that all the odium of “*scandalous perversion*” falls on your head.

From the following observation, which you make with all the consequence of inquisitorial authority, we may bless the hand of Providence who has not permitted the inquisition to erect its banner in this country; for were that the case with you at the head of it, Sir W. D. no doubt

would be the first object of your holy labour. You say, " But under all circumstances, I anticipate from the generality of persons, a decided acknowledgment that neither he, nor any one, ought to be permitted to circulate, even in an *unpublished* work, such gross misstatements and perversions, without that contradiction which may prevent his readers from being led into error." A pretty plain sample is this of the dove-like spirit of the Christian Advocate, so called. It is the spirit of Peter, who, while he was yet unconverted, had recourse to the sword ; it is the intolerant spirit of persecution, which, if it had power, would raise the religious *war-heap*, and lead its opposers to the faggot in Smithfield. But it is not the spirit of Christ who could have called for fire from heaven to have destroyed his opposers, for the spirit of Christ is not a spirit of persecution. I certainly was one, unsolicited by Sir W. D. who obtained



the favour of two volumes of the *Œdipus* for gentlemen of learning in London ; and who I know entertain the highest opinion of the sanctity of the Scriptures, and was told by them that they never expected in their day to see so much done towards restoring the Scriptures to their true meaning, agreeably to the intention of the sacred writers. By the way, it is well to remind the reader, that you have laboured hard in the former part of your libel, to prove that the *Œdipus* is a *published work*, but by the above remark, viz. "that neither he (Sir W.) nor any " one ought to be permitted to circulate, even " in an *unpublished* work, such gross mis-statements," you really, in plain terms, admit, that the *Œdipus* is an *unpublished work*; a school-boy, on the first form, would smile at such inconsistency. Alas ! for Christianity, if it had no better advocates than the *Cambridge Christian Advocate*, so called.

In page 58 you venture to declare, that as we have translations "of two thousand years date from the present time, made by persons specially selected as the best qualified for the purpose, partly when the language was a living one, and because we have the opinions of most profound Hebrew scholars, the Buxtorf's, Morinus's, Capellus's, &c." that such passages cannot "have been understood in a sense totally wrong." I shall refer you again to the CLASSICAL JOURNAL, where you will find that the before-mentioned Hebraist in his answers to Deists, has given undeniable proof concerning the inaccuracy of the present translation. You will also find abundant reason to conclude that the above-mentioned Hebrew scholars, the Buxtorf's, Morinus's, &c. have contented themselves with going to the sepulchre of Jerome; and the vulgate, which was taken from his translation made in the ninth century, has stood the

same ever since with all its errors, says Mr. B. made by a man, who (like you) was so unqualified for the undertaking, that he was obliged to employ a Jew, who did not understand the Latin language. I will refer you to one passage among the many, in order to convince you that though we have "translations of two thousand years date, such passages have been understood in a sense totally wrong." In the xxxviii. of Isaiah, ver. 8. You will find it thus in the original Hebrew—**דגני משיב את צל המעלות**—אשר ירדה במעלות אחז בשמש אחרנית עשר מעלות. In our Bible, and in all the European Bibles, this passage stands thus:—*Behold I will bring again the shadow of the degrees which is gone down in the sun-dial of Ahaz, ten degrees backward.* Now according to your statement, this, as well as hundreds of passages, should be the true sense of the original Hebrew. But I shall be able to convince even you, Sir, that *no such*

*circumstance* is related. That *no such circumstance* was intended to be recorded, as the *shadow returning ten degrees, on the dial of Ahaz*, will appear evident by turning to the corresponding passage in the Septuagint, which perfectly agrees with the Hebrew, but is altogether contrary to the received translations. And yet we are told by you, that, “as profound Hebrew scholars have suffered such passages to remain, they must convey the true sense of the original.” *δέκα ἀναβαθμὸν τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ πατρὸς σου ὁ ἥλιος.* Now, Sir, for once, open your English Bible and compare this passage with the Septuagint translation; and though you cannot give the translation of this passage from the Hebrew, nor inform us to what circumstance it relates, which is most important for the credit of our religion and the Bible, yet I suppose you are sufficiently acquainted with the Greek to know that the English translation altogether

differs from the Septuagint, and that no such circumstance as the shadow going back on the dial of Ahaz is mentioned. It refers to a circumstance which is rational and just, and is calculated to impress the mind with the superintending providence of God in a far higher degree, than if the shadow had gone back on the dial. The European translations of such passages are only calculated to disgust intelligent men; they tell you they do not believe it, and they do well; it does not impress the mind with the sanctity of the Scripture; it was too trifling for the Divine Being to amuse the king in his garden. But as it is not recorded in the Hebrew nor in the Septuagint, I hope you will not brand Sir W. D. with the epithet of *infidel*, because he ventures to differ from you on a subject, which you, Sir, do not believe, though you are ready openly to countenance this libel on the sacred Scripture.

But you think that when God had created man, he left him to a wide world, as ignorant respecting those things necessary to be known for his happiness as the beasts of the field. You have asserted, that the ancients, even in the time of the Hebrews, had no method of determining the precise time of the New Moon, but "by the extremely rough method of watching for its first appearance after its conjunction with the Sun." You, therefore, in order to refute Sir W. D., who carries the invention of the twelve signs of the Zodiac beyond the time of Moses, refer this invention to less remote times; and you are so infatuated as to suppose that it is of Grecian origin, "that the sphere was modelled into the form which it now bears by Greeks." Thus, during the monarchies of the ancient Egyptians, Babylonians, Persians, and other ancient nations, you ignorantly suppose that they blundered on for

thousands of years without having any exact method of determining the *precise* time of the New Moon, but "by this extremely rough " method of watching for its first appearance," till a little horde of Pagan Greeks improved the science of astronomy, "and modelled the Zodiac " into the form which it now bears."

You also tell us that "to what particular " stars the names Chesel, Kimah, Mezzaroth, " &c. applied, can only be matter of vague conjecture." Had you understood the Hebrew, you would have known that these names are applied to the constellations Orion, Arcturus, &c. which Greek names have been retained instead of the Hebrew. Again you observe that "we are acquainted with the sphere as it " exists with us, bearing Grecian names, and " allusions to Grecian mythology; we are not " acquainted with it, bearing Egyptian names,

“ and conveying allusions to Egyptian mythology or history.” This remark does not carry a grain of conviction with it. I will ask you a question :—what was the reason that the first Christian churches, beginning with the Apostles, read the Scriptures in Greek, and used a Greek ritual ? Would any writer be justified in saying that the New Testament, being translated into Greek at the dispersion of the Jews, was originally written in the Greek language by native Hebrews ? The obvious reason why the sphere bears Grecian names, and allusions to Grecian mythology, is, that when the Egyptian mythology passed into Greece, where the Egyptian language was not understood, the Grecian names answering to the Egyptian names were affixed instead. It argues great ignorance indeed to assert, that because “ we are “ acquainted with the sphere, as it exists with “ us, bearing Grecian names, and allusions to



" Grecian mythology, it was modelled in the  
 " form which it now bears by Greeks." Should  
 the Greek language in process of time become  
 extinct, and English names be substituted  
 instead, a writer might with equal propriety  
 say, " we are acquainted with the sphere  
 " as it exists with us, bearing English names,  
 " and allusions to English mythology; we are  
 " not acquainted with it bearing Egyptian  
 " names, and conveying allusions to Egyp-  
 " tian mythology or history." And thus con-  
 clude, that being " acquainted with the sphere  
 " as it might then exist, bearing English names,  
 " and conveying allusions to English mythology,  
 " it was modelled in the form which it might  
 " then bear by the English."

You say " many of our constellations not  
 " only bear Grecian names, but seem so peculiar  
 " to the fabulous history of Greece, that they

" must have had their origin there, and no where  
 " else. Among these we may mention the  
 " Centaur, Pegasus, the harp of Orpheus, per-  
 " haps the ship Argo. On the other hand, I  
 " know not that any one constellation can be  
 " mentioned of an origin peculiarly Egyptian."  
 This is a bold assertion; " must have had their  
 " origin there and no where else."

It is very strange, and almost unaccountable,  
 that some persons should wish to place the Greek  
 above Hebrew authority. There can be no doubt  
 but that it arises from an inordinate love for the  
 writings of those Pagans—and the Christian Ad-  
 vocate, who ought to preach with the Old Testa-  
 ment in one hand, and the New Testament in  
 the other, would rather go to the Pagan Greeks,  
 and give the palm of originality to those idola-  
 ters, than he would go to the Hebrew, (were he  
 capable,) and draw his information from those

venerable pages, from whence it must be allowed the Greeks received those significant symbols, which he has ventured to assert "had their origin in Greece and no where else."

Turn then, Sir, to the pages of the original Hebrew, and you will find from whence the Greeks copied their *Centaur*, *Pegasus*, *Harp*, and *ship Argo*. There you will find "that the constellations can be mentioned of an origin *peculiarly Egyptian*," for ages before the petty horde of Greeks existed. You will there find among the idolatrous worshippers, *Centaur idols*, *Pegasean horses*, or *horses of the sun*, *chariots of the sun*, &c. For horses were chosen by them to represent the sun, they being the swiftest of all animals, if we calculate on time and distance, and of greater use to man than other animals; even as the sun is the swiftest of all the heavenly bodies, and of greater use to

man than any of the planets : and for this reason it was that horses were chosen to represent the sun. There you will find the *Harp* to be of a far more ancient origin than the Harp of Orpheus ; *Genesis*, iv. 21. *And his brother's name was Jubal ; he was the father of all such as handle the HARP and the organ.* — There you will find Perseus and Andromeda — Castor and Pollux — Bellerophon — clearly and manifestly deduced from the narratives wholly EGYPTIAN ; and not from the narratives “ of the early Grecian history,” as you have asserted. But, Sir, there needs no other proof of your great want of attention to the original Hebrew Scriptures, than for you to say, as you have said, that “ we should certainly run counter to all authority, if we were to refer these names to a period so remote, that the constellations in general could have been formed from them so early as 1400 or 1500 years B. C.” But it is

evident, beyond the possibility of a contradiction, that the constellations were formed in the time of the antediluvians, and preserved by ancient nations, to whom the Greeks were indebted for all the information they had respecting these things.—Hence, Sir, you may see that the harp is not “so peculiar to the “fabulous history of Greece, that it must have “had its origin there, and no where else,” as you positively say it had. There can be no doubt but that the harp of Jubal, and not the harp of the modern Greek, was chosen by the first race of the antediluvians to represent that constellation of the sphere. For, as I have hinted above, it is worse than Pagan ignorance, and argues a disbelief in the arrangement of divine wisdom to suppose, as you do, that God, when he had created man, left him in a state of ignorance like the wild beasts. If you will turn to the Hebrew Criticisms in the CLASSICAL

JOURNAL, you will have reason to conclude that the first race of men were gifted with knowledge, far superior to any thing that has been known to their posterity, and that the Divine Being who had planted such intuitive knowledge in the first race of men to know the natures of the creatures, and to give them names corresponding to their qualities and propensities, (a display of wisdom which cannot be comprehended by us, but which could only be given by the Creator,) would, with this perfection of knowledge, give them also an understanding to comprehend what was more necessary for man to know, viz. the knowledge of Astronomy to regulate their time, their ceremonies at stated periods, their years, and months, without being under the necessity of adopting "the  
 " extremely rough method of watching for the  
 " first appearance of the New Moon, in order to  
 " guess at the time of its conjunction with the

“ Sun.” (See *Genesis*, ch. i.)— Beside, not to mention the great absurdity of supposing that the Greeks ever believed the tales, which their poets told of the harp of Orpheus, — that he descended into hell — charmed the king — stopped the course of the most rapid rivers — tamed the savage beasts, and made the mountains move by the music of his harp: and that for this reason the harp of Orpheus was placed in the sphere, and “ being so peculiar to the “ fabulous history of Greece, that it must have “ had its origin there, and no where else,” as is asserted by you, argues very little knowledge concerning the origin of these things. — In the situation, Sir, in which you stand as Christian Advocate, it was your duty, (whatever you might think to the contrary,) to have maintained the sanctity of the Scripture, the wisdom and goodness of the Divine Being, together with his superintending providence, in giving man that

knowledge which could not have been known by him, had he been, as you suppose, created like a wild beast. Instead of which, you have, from your extreme ignorance of these things, endeavoured to represent the sacred writers as a set of ignorant men, who were the most learned men, and the greatest philosophers that ever appeared on earth. You have, Sir, endeavoured to depreciate the Scriptures, by setting in opposition to them the opinions of the Pagan Greeks; and by such a Pagan principle, you have insulted the Majesty of Heaven in his providence, by supposing that he left man to founder in the world in a state of profound ignorance: you have given us a specimen of your vanity, by supposing that man by his own wisdom was the inventor of the science of astronomy; that nothing of this nature is to be found in the Scriptures; and that all this was done in modern times, by a few



**Pagan individuals, residing in the Islands of the Archipelago.**

**But again : Why, Sir, do you so decidedly and authoritatively assert, that " the ship Argo " seems so peculiar to the fabulous history of " Greece ; that it must have had its origin " there, and no where else ?" Why, Sir, I will tell you. You have dabbled in Greek mythology, without knowing that it was copied from the Scriptures ; you have read of the ship Argo, and either ignorantly or wantonly have supposed that it gave rise to the constellation of the ship. If you wish to know the origin of this constellation, you certainly will not find it in the pages of the Pagan Grecian mythology, but in the ancient pages of the Bible. I will not be so uncharitable as to suppose, however, that you have made this blunder wilfully, or wantonly, to depreciate the original Hebrew, by**

endeavouring to show that we are indebted to the Pagan Greeks for the science of Astronomy. It is better to accuse you of ignorance, for that carries its own punishment with it.

The word *Argo* seems to be of doubtful origin; some derive it from *Ἄργος*, the name of the person who built the ship, — others think that it was built at the city of Argos. Diodorus derives it from *ἄργος*, *swift*, alluding to the swiftness of its sailing. Most people know, that it is said to have been the ship which carried Jason and 54 of his companions to Colchis, to recover the golden fleece, which was 79 years before the destruction of Troy, and 1268 years before Christ. The golden fleece is a Grecian fable; it was first brought into this shape to commemorate the Egyptian festival of the slain lamb, or the feast of the passover. But in the space of two hundred years, or from the time of

Moses to the Argonaut expedition, the true intention of this paschal festivity was forgotten. The Greeks, who had heard of the slain lamb from the Hebrews, supposed this representative image possessed those virtues and powers which would protect the national possessors of it from all impending dangers. It must appear evident that it was taken from the Egyptian festival of the *slain lamb*, which made its way into Greece when the Hebrews arrived at the land of Canaan, and became their neighbours ; and so, in process of time, the true understanding of it, when the Greeks adopted Polytheism, was lost. This appears plain from what the Grecian fable-writers have said respecting Jason ; that, in order to gain the fleece, he was to tame the bulls which had brazen feet and horns, and vomited smoke and fire—to sow in the plain the teeth of a dragon, from which armed men were to arise, and to be destroyed

by his hand—to kill the ever-watchful dragon, which was at the bottom of the tree, on which the golden fleece was suspended, &c. The meaning of fables, according to Johnson, is “to tell falsehoods;” and as these are evidently fables, it is surprising to me, and must be to every one, that you should attempt to destroy the testimony of the sacred writers respecting these things, by contending that they had their origin from the Pagan Greeks.

I shall now prove that this “constellation” can be mentioned of an origin peculiarly “Egyptian.” What think you of a ship said to have been built at the command of God; not for the business of war—not for robbery and plunder, like the ship Argo—but, according to the history, for the purpose of saving the last and best of the human race, some thousands of years before the petty state of Greece was in existence

as a nation? I mean the Ark of Noah. What objection, Sir, can you have to the ship תִּבְהָ, *Theebah*? This was the name of the ship, which, on account of its magnitude and the greatness of the design, to commemorate the great event of the Flood, was by the patriarchs placed on the sphere; which was also in after time retained, and gave the name *Theebes* to that ancient Egyptian city.—But when we turn our attention to the ship Argo, which in truth was nothing more than a barge with 25 oars, not larger than the Lord Mayor's barge, into which Jason is said to have crammed 54 of his companions; and that this was built for the purpose of rapine, plunder, and murder; how absurd it must be in the Christian Advocate, or any other Christian, — nay, I will say criminal, to foist this pretended Pagan account into the calendar of the constellations! I say *pretended account*, for as Aristotle observes, “there never was such a person

“ as Orpheus the Greek:” —so Common Sense says, that as he is declared to be one of the 54 men who went on this expedition, which takes into its list the accomplishment of things altogether impossible, and which never were in existence ; so every part of the fable must agree. This will prove that there was no ship *Argo* ; no taming of the *bulls with brazen horns and feet, vomiting smoke and fire* ; that the *teeth of a dragon were never sown* ; no *army springing out of the ground* ; that there was no *watchful dragon, which is said to have watched without sleeping at the tree where the golden fleece was suspended* : but that the whole was evidently a fable, or at the best that something was conveyed by way of allegory, which does not appear in the letter —a customary way of communicating information at that day, which the Greeks copied from the Hebrews, and the Hebrews from the Egyptians.

I had almost forgotten to say a few words more concerning the ancient Egyptian festival of the Ram when the Sun entered Aries. If we allow that the ancient Egyptians celebrated this festival at this time of the year, there is no occasion for concluding that the Hebrews took it solely from this Egyptian feast of the slain ram: as well may Christians be accused of being Jews, because they observe the time when the great sacrifice Christ, was offered up at the same time when the Jews keep the Passover; of which the very ancient Egyptian feast of the slain ram was a type. There can be no doubt concerning the feast of the ram, or lamb, being celebrated by the Egyptians before the time of Moses, at the vernal equinox. For as I have before observed, the Hebrews were commanded to slay the lamb, and to keep the feast of the Passover in the month Abib, or *the month of green fruits*, as the original signifies, which was at the time when the Sun entered Aries.

The Hebrew word **זֶבֶל** *Jobeel*, means a *ram*; it has the same meaning as *Aries* in Latin, and the Arabians to this day call a ram *Jobel*. The Hebrews were commanded to take a *male lamb*, for the paschal sacrifice, which was to be a male of the first year, *Exod.* xii. 5; and the name by which a ram of the first year is called, you may find in *Josh.* vi. 4. שבעה שפרות זיבולים לפני דוארן *seven horns of rams before the face of the Ark.* *Septem tubas arietum*\*.—Now it appears plainly from the Hebrew, and other authorities, that the festival of the slain lamb, was celebrated when the Sun entered Aries; therefore the learned author of the *Œdipus Judaicus* has well considered his subject, for though he or any writer may with the utmost propriety say, that the paschal feast was taken from an ancient Egyptian festival, he does not presume to doubt

\* Montanus.



your profound knowledge respecting these things, by telling you what every Christian Advocate, who is not better acquainted with the fables of the Pagan Greeks than he is with the Bible, ought to know, that this ancient Egyptian festival was handed down to them from the Fall, and to the time of Moses, when the true meaning and application were again given, which had been lost in fable; that it signified the coming of the true Messiah, the *male lamb* slain from the foundation of the world, which was accomplished at the commencement of the Christian dispensation; when, agreeably to the universal consent of all prophecy, and the expectation of all nations, Messiah came, and all sacrificial worship ceased for ever.

But, Sir, what was the reason that you omitted mentioning another constellation, which

can also with the utmost effect and propriety claim an "origin peculiarly Egyptian," as well as all the rest of the constellations? You have not said a word about the *serpent*, — there needs no comment on this to show that it is "peculiarly Egyptian." Every man, woman, and child in Christendom, who can read their Bible, must allow that Moses set up the serpent in the Wilderness when he led the Hebrews from Egypt, and that on account of the cures which were performed, it was worshipped over all the east before the time of the Greeks. But you may also be convinced by the original Hebrew, that the serpent was in high estimation among the nations many ages before the time of Moses. This, Sir, was the origin of the constellation which bears the name *serpentarius*; from which it is evident; that all these "*constellations* can be mentioned of an origin peculiarly Egyptian." If you were acquainted with the order

and descent of ancient religion, you would not have said, "to derive *any* part of Egyptian mythology from the Zodiac, requires the assumption of the very doubtful hypothesis, of the zodiacal signs having been formed at that remote period." You would have known, that the Greeks received their mythology from the Cretans, the Cretans from the Phœnicians, the Phœnicians from the Hebrews, the Hebrews from the Egyptians, and the Egyptians from the Antediluvians. (See *Classical Journal*.)—It has often puzzled me to know why the Clergy should be so infatuated with the Greek, and totally neglect Hebrew learning. But on reading the *Biblical* articles in the *Classical Journal*, I found it was because Hebrew has for some ages been considered as unnecessary. It is there shown, that Hebrew is as necessary as Greek, and that a true understanding of a great part of Scripture in the translation, cannot be

had without a critical knowledge of the original language. "When Deism made such a rapid progress in France, so absolutely necessary was it thought that the Clergy should be Hebrew scholars, that an Act was passed which did not permit any one to enter into orders unless he was competent in the language. But," says the above mentioned writer, "if it were necessary for the support of the religion of the Bible, at that period, to enforce the moral precepts, for good order and subordination among all ranks of society, how much more so at this period, when Deism, aided by the translations so contrary to the true sense in the original, with brazen-faced impudence, threatens to annihilate the religion of the Bible."

These remarks may be of use to you and others who are accustomed to draw hasty con-

clusions, as they will serve to show that the Scriptures when truly translated, do not contain fulsome stories like the pages of the Pagan Greeks, inconsistent with reason, common sense, and sound speech ; but in many parts contain in an historical form, allegorical descriptions, applicable to all states, circumstances, knowledges, and things. On which account, Sir, you ought to feel how grossly you have insulted the learned writer of the *Œdipus*, not only in language better suited for the lowest orders of society, but in charging him with an attempt to ridicule the Scriptures, which in the original he holds in the highest estimation. But, Sir, if his knowledge of the original has convinced him; that there is nothing inconsistent with that truth and dignity which characterises the sacred Scriptures, surely as he has a common interest in its welfare, so he has a common right to show that there is a necessity for a revision of the

translation. And if you turn to Mr. B.'s Criticisms in the CLASSICAL JOURNAL, you will be convinced that such a revision would be attended with the happiest consequences to society\*.

To conclude this Letter, I must say, that the heads of Colleges have been greatly deceived in making choice of such a man to fill the office of Christian Advocate; a man — who (to use your libellous words)

\* We have it from the best authority, that the late worthy much to be lamented Mr. PERCIVAL, who was himself a learned man, on reading the above-mentioned gentleman's *Biblical Criticisms* in the *Classical Journal*, was so perfectly satisfied that there was an absolute necessity for a revision of the translation, that he informed the writer of them, after much conversation with him, he would immediately bring it forward.

“ has given such gross specimens of inaccuracy and ignorance, produced with all the confidence and the pretension of the most profound and accurate learning.”

I am, &c.

*BIBLICUS.*

# **A LETTER**

**IN ANSWER TO**

**THE REV. MR. D'OYLY;**

***BY CANDIDUS.***





## A LETTER, &amp;c.

SIR,

AFTER having perused the Letters which have been addressed to you by *Vindex* and *Biblicus*, I should not have thought it necessary to have troubled you with an additional epistle in the defence of my esteemed friend SIR WILLIAM DRUMMOND, if I had not been of opinion that there is one topic on which those learned gentlemen have not sufficiently insisted. I am (though not of your Church,) a professing Christian as well as yourself; and I have regretted the appearance of your last book, both because it does great injustice to the talents and

character of a gentleman whom I highly respect, and because I sincerely think it will be injurious to the cause which we must both wish to support.

When your first book was announced, I was rather surprised at the step which you had taken; but my astonishment was great indeed, and I could not help thinking, that you had much exceeded the bounds of moderation, when I found that you had accused the author of the *Œdipus Judaicus* of blasphemy, and I know not how many crimes. There is certainly a censurable levity in some of the passages which you quote. But assuredly these passages are not blasphemous. Blasphemy implies a deliberate intention to insult the Majesty of God; and you should not have advanced upon slight grounds so cruel and terrible a charge. There are many parts of the *Œdipus Judaicus*, which prove that the author of that work is most deeply

impressed with the reverence which is due to the Supreme Being from the creatures of his hand. The passages in question should be taken in connexion with the rest of the work. They would have been better omitted altogether; but still it is but fair to say, that the ridicule which the author employs is manifestly directed against the particular mode of interpretation to which he objects, and by no means against the books of the Old Testament. I must say then, that I cannot consider your conduct as very Christian-like, in stigmatizing the *Œdipus Judaicus* as a blasphemous work. Archbishop TILLOTSON, and other excellent Divines of your Church, have ridiculed the interpretation which the Roman Catholics have given of some most important texts in the New Testament, which the Romanists have chosen to understand according to the letter. These Romanists accuse the Protestants of blasphemy; but we reply

that in ridiculing their interpretation of the Scriptures, we respect and reverence the word of God as much as they do themselves, and believe, through Christ's grace, that we understand it better. No vital part of our faith is assailed by the author's ridicule. It is merely the literal interpretation of some books of the Old Testament, and in particular places, to which he objects.

Your Pamphlet drew upon you the answer of the gentleman who signs himself *Vindex*, and who treated you with considerable severity. Now when the violence of your attack against an unpublished work, which was not distributed in the manner which you have so unjustly stated, is considered, can it be thought extraordinary, that the learned gentleman who undertook the defence of the author, should have treated you with scarcely more civility than you had shown

for his client. Far more advanced in life than that gentleman, and I believe than yourself, I could have wished to have seen more temper on both sides, especially on subjects so much connected with religion.

The last Pamphlet which you have published is, I am sorry to say it, when I consider your station, the most intemperate and virulent which in the course of a pretty long life I ever remember to have seen. There is little in it concerning religious matters, and nothing concerning any vital question of our faith. Your sole object is to prove, that the author of the *Oedipus Judaicus* is a very ignorant dull man, and that all those who have considered him as learned and able must be as ignorant and dull as he is. You have paid no compliment to my white hair in this, for I still continue to admire the *Oedipus Judaicus* as a very ingenious work;

and though upon some points I differ from the learned author, and scruple not to tell him so, I can see neither wisdom nor justice in the torrent of abuse which you have poured out against him.

You have accused **SIR WILLIAM DRUMMOND** of being ignorant of the Hebrew ; and yet it appears from the Letters of *Biblicus* and *Vindex*, that you are in the wrong in *every one* of the examples which you have brought forward. This is surely no proof of your prudence or discretion. . Some Freethinkers will take advantage of it, to say, that the friends of religion support their cause by trying to depreciate, without the least regard to truth, all those who are suspected of heterodox opinions ; and of endeavouring, by unjust accusations, to destroy the credit which they may possess for learning and ability. You ought, surely, in your situation to have

known, that if the Christian Religion had been attacked by the author of the *Œdipus Judaicus*, which it is not, it was very unnecessary for you to run into a strain of abuse so little consistent with the duties of your office, and so little to the purpose in support of your cause. Never let it be said that Christians are forced to defend their doctrines by making false charges, be they what they may, against their adversaries. We want no such aids. What good end could it possibly answer to accuse SIR WILLIAM DRUMMOND of being ignorant of the Hebrew? The reverse is well known to be the case; and you might have been sure that the proofs which you advanced of his ignorance would be strictly examined. It turns out that you have made as many blunders as accusations. You had better have let the subject alone.

Upon the astronomical parts of the work



you have likewise spoken in a very unbecoming tone. I find from the letters of *Vindex* that you have not pointed out above two or three mistakes, which the author had not corrected long before your Pamphlet appeared ; and that in other examples, where you have unjustly accused him of committing mistakes, you have fallen into greater errors yourself. Now all this is certainly injurious to your cause. Your language is intemperate beyond example. Ignorance, falsehood, presumption, &c. &c. are terms for ever in your mouth ; and then, when the grounds of these accusations are examined, it is almost always yourself who are found to be in the wrong.

As to the allegorical explanations of Sir WILLIAM DRUMMOND, I have always told him with frankness, that I could not in some instances agree with him, though I have no

scruple in saying that I do think there is more in this allegorical theory, than I should perhaps have been once prepared to admit. You, however, do great injustice to that gentleman in accusing him of carrying this system as far as DUPUIS and VOLNEY have done. I have often questioned him upon this point; and he has uniformly answered me in the negative, and given me satisfactory reasons for drawing the line between them and himself.

Upon the whole I cannot but regret, that the Christian Advocate should have published a Pamphlet such as your last. There is, or at least there seems to be, more ill-nature in it against an individual who has offended you, than zeal for Christianity, of which indeed you say very little. You have attacked SIR WILLIAM DRUMMOND as a man of honour, (for you accuse him of telling falsehoods without any

ceremony,) and as a man of letters. An intimacy of more than twenty years standing, enables me to say, that a man of stricter honour than the author of the *Edipus Judaicus* does not exist. In your attack on his literary character, you will not appear to real judges to have succeeded, though *Vindex* tells me, that you are cheered by some of the Reviewers. Now again for this I am very sorry, not for the sake of my friend only, but for the sake of that cause in the support of which, I trust, on future occasions, you will contend with more propriety of manners than you have done in the present instance. Indeed you have committed so many mistakes, (as is clearly proved by *Biblicus* and *Vindex*,) that I cannot but conclude that your book must have been written in great haste, as well as in great wrath. It is, however, not the less to be regretted, that you should not have considered your charges with more attention

before you made them, for blunders are certainly most censurable when a writer is inveighing against another person, and loading him with reproach and contumely. But besides all this, it bears something too much of the character of an Inquisition, when a Churchman and his party try to beat down and trample upon a man's reputation, because he is not in their opinion so orthodox as he ought to be; and the matter is made much worse, when it appears, as it does in the present case, that while you are reviling an author for his ignorance, you are generally wrong in the examples which you have brought forward in evidence against him. If you had reproved SIR WILLIAM DRUMMOND for the use of some objectionable expressions to which I have already alluded, and had stated your reasons for rejecting his allegorical system in a decent and Christian-like manner, I should only have wondered at your choosing to take

notice of an unpublished work, which might be yet corrected and altered by its author, especially as I am informed, that several published books of no dubious tendency might more naturally have attracted your attention. But you have written a most virulent Pamphlet against the author as a man of literature, and though, either from haste, or intemperance of disposition, you are almost always in the wrong, yet you are, I am told, supported by others, who probably have not very minutely examined the matters in dispute, and who are guided rather by their zeal than by their knowledge, in taking part with you. Undoubtedly it is most natural, that every Christian should join to oppose the machinations of infidels ; but there should be no injustice in the means, and no mistake about the object. I abhor persecution in all its shapes. The Romish Inquisition tortures its victims. Is it less than torture to an enlightened man, who

has acquired a reputation for learning and talents, to hear himself unjustly charged with gross stupidity and ignorance, while such a clamour is raised against him that he cannot be heard in his own defence? Is it no torture for such a man to be driven from the Republic of Letters by an accuser, who is scarcely ever in the right through the long catalogue of his specific charges? Our holy religion wants no such auxiliary as persecution; and it is persecution—cruel persecution, unjustly to take away the moral and literary reputation even of an infidel.

But the author of the *Cædipus Judaicus* is no infidel; and if he were, I should be slow to accuse a man of being an infidel, because his method of understanding the Books of Moses and Joshua might not be mine. Neither would I condemn a writer as a profane blasphemer, for a few light expressions, probably penned

without due reflection. I would rather consider the general bearing and tenor of his work. I am an old man, and shall conclude by saying to you, what I often repeat to myself, " Judge  
" not, that ye be not judged."

I am,

Your very obedient Servant,

August 2d, 1813.

*CANDIDUS.*

**ERRATA.**

---

- Page** 31, line 14, *for* coarsest *read* coarsest  
 54, — 18, *dele* not  
 74, — 9, *for* λευκὸν *read* λευκόν  
 82, — 9, *for* text *read* test  
 102, — 16, *for* person *read* persons  
 112, — 2, *for* Judaicus *Œdipus read* *Œdipus*  
                   Judaicus

▲ ▲



---

Printed by D. N. SHURY, No. 7, Berwick Street, Soho, London

~~~~~  
1813.

0, Lada





